This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

CONVERTED LIBRARY
OF THE
University of California.

No. 2155.
Division
Range
Shelf
Received July, 1870.

PRINTING BINDING
A. L. BANCROFT & Co.
Booksellers and Stationers
721 MARKET ST.
SAN FRANCISCO.

DISCUSSION

103

OF

UNIVERSALISM,

OR A

Defence of Orthodoxy

AGAINST THE HERESY OF UNIVERSALISM,

AS ADVOCATED BY MR. ABNER KNEELAND,

IN THE DEBATE

IN THE UNIVERSALIST CHURCH, LOMBARD STREET,

JULY, 1824,

AND IN HIS VARIOUS PUBLICATIONS,

AS ALSO IN THOSE OF MR. BALLOU, AND OTHERS.

THE PROFITS OF THIS IMPRESSION TO GO TO THE FUNDS OF THE YOUNG MEN'S DOMESTIC MISSIONARY SOCIETY, COMPOSED OF DIFFERENT DENOMINATIONS.

BY W. L. M'CALLA.

PHILADELPHIA: PRINTED BY JOHN YOUNG, 34, NORTH THIRD STREET.

1825.

BX 9947
M3

Eastern District of Pennsylvania, to wit:

Be it remembered, that on the twenty-fourth day of January, in the forty-ninth year of the Independence of the United States of America, A. D. 1825, WILLIAM LATTA M'CALLA, of the said District, hath deposited in this Office the Title of a Book, the right whereof he claims as Author, in the words following, to wit:

"A Discussion of Universalism; or a Defence of Orthodoxy, against the "Heresy of Universalism, as advocated by Mr. Abner Kneeland, in the Debate in "the Universalist Church in Lombard-street, July, 1824, and in his various publica-"tions, as also, in those of Mr. Ballou and others. The profits of the impression "to go to the Funds of the Young Men's Domestic Missionary Society, composed "of different denominations. By W. L. M'Calla."

In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, entitled, "An Act for the Encouragement of Learning, by securing the Copies of Maps, Charts, and Books to the Authors and Proprietors of such Copies, during the times therein mentioned;"—And also to the Act, entitled, "An Act for the Encouragement of Learning, by securing the Copies of Maps, Charts, and Books to the Authors and Proprietors of such Copies during the times therein mentioned," and extending the Benefits thereof to the Arts of designing, engraving, and etching historical and other prints."

D. CALDWELL,
Clerk of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

PREFACE.

SHORTLY after my arrival in this place, last May, information was received from various quarters, that Mr. Kneeland had long been in the habit of defying the armies of the living God, and of glorying in their silence as the effect of conscious guilt and error. Aware of my own weakness, but confiding in the Great Head of the Church, it was impossible to conceal my desire that he would challenge *me*. A mutual friend gave him an intimation of my willingness to accept a personal invitation, but without effect. His general challenge was then made the ground of a correspondence which terminated in a public conference. This was not, by any means, intended to supercede the necessity of a printed defence, but to excite the public attention to such a work, and to make it more worthy of their patronage, as well as to silence the audacious boasting of this enemy of God and man. He soon betrayed a great anxiety to terminate the debate. After several unsuccessful efforts, he cut it short by virtually closing the door of *his desk* upon me. Sickness and the heat of the city soon obliged me to retire to the country. This was called *a retreat*, and it was boldly and publicly denied that the doors of the church were shut upon me. To settle these points, an offer was made to resume the discussion, which offer he was *very far* from accepting. To retrieve their loss, a Universalist preacher, a pretended stenographer, was *employed* to write the debate in such a way as to transfer the victory from one side to the other. Although he at first promised verbal accuracy, he at last professed to give *the argument* only: but this was as far beyond his capacity as it was contrary to his wish. The performance of his enterprise with fidelity and ability, would have been much more gratifying to me and my friends than to him and his. Yet every one conversant with such matters, knows that in such discussions, an argument is more diluted than it should be when committed to paper; and that it is not necessary to record repeated refutations of the same error, which were made necessary in debate, in order to meet the extemporaneous and reiterated effusions of heretical sophistry. Although the employed stenographer professed to do justice to my argument, he has been guilty of such omissions and interpolations, transpositions and alterations, as were calculated to destroy it. While, for the sake of perspi-

cuity and precision, I take the liberty of arranging and condensing the matter of the discussion, in such a manner as is suitable to written composition, the hearer will see that real justice is done to the argument on both sides. As my opponent has had a full opportunity of *speaking* for himself, so, in revising and correcting the work of his *employed* Reporter, he has had a full opportunity of *writing* for himself. To copy all that he has published, through his stenographer, for himself and for me, is not my design. Any one who has read those drowsy pages will readily excuse me, and any one who has not, may see a fair specimen in the piece signed *Long-hand*, published in the Democratic Press, of Sept. 22nd, and copied in No. 21, of the Introductory Documents in this work. This is one of the least important of many newspaper publications connected with this controversy, with which it is thought proper to occupy the first part of this volume. For reasons explained in the introductory documents, its bulk will also be increased by additional matter both in confirmation and refutation; and the latter of these shall now take the precedency, as the arguments of my opponent are all before me, in what he calls "as faithful a report as ever was made."

INTRODUCTORY DOCUMENTS.

No. 1.

THE CHALLENGE.

In the Philadelphia edition of Buck's Theological Dictionary, by Edwin T. Scott, 1823, Mr. Kneeland, under the article *Universalists*, boasts that several works written by himself and Mr. Ballou, "have never been answered." He was also in the habit of giving challenges from the pulpit, and he and his followers were in the practice of boasting that they were not accepted. In a note attached to his 8th *Lecture*, he says, "at each publication, the learned clergy have been respectfully called upon to shew wherein these statements are incorrect. They have not seen fit to do it; and it is believed, for this good reason, because they knew the statements are true. As, therefore, the most important facts contained in this Lecture have been more than *thirteen years* before the public, and yet remain uncontroverted, they now come forth with this additional evidence of their truth. Because it is fair to presume (the facts here stated being so important in themselves to the cause of religion) that if they could have been contradicted, with any colour of evidence, they would have been before this time." The following are extracts from the preface to his Lectures, viz. "The work has had an opportunity to be fully tested by public opinion; and notwithstanding the substance of the eighth Lecture (which is the most important of any in point of doctrine,) has been before the public nearly twenty years, and it is now more than five years since this work was first published, yet no one has attempted to point out a single error, in relation to the facts as herein stated, or to shew that any of the arguments are either unfounded or inconclusive. This is considered as a silent acknowledgement, that in the opinion of the clergy generally, the work is unanswerable: otherwise, being so often and so respectfully called upon to consider the doctrine and arguments here advanced, and point out the errors, if there be any, it is difficult to account

for their silence on this subject." "He therefore once more respectfully *invites* and *intreats* the clergy of other denominations, or some *one* of them, the more learned the better, to *discuss* this important subject with him, and to point out to him and the public, the supposed errors of the following work."

No. 2.

THE ACCEPTANCE.

MR. KNEELAND,

It is said that the Universalists have two Churches in the city, and there is a report in circulation that permission has been asked and obtained for me to preach in one of them. If I ever gave leave to any of my friends to make this request for me, (which is quite probable,) it was done inadvertently. But as it was granted, I take this opportunity of acknowledging the favour, and of informing you, or your friends through you, that for the present, the acceptance of it is declined. This is done, not from a belief that it is unlawful to preach our distinguishing doctrines in such a place, butb ecause I prefer coming in contact with you, in a manner which has hitherto been more agreeable to your own wishes. I am informed that you have discussed the most prominent question in your creed with several laymen, and that you have, privately and publicly, given verbal and written invitations to the clergy in general, to defend their faith in public debate. This general invitation was published, perhaps, in the first edition of your "Lectures on the doctrine of Universal Benevolence," in 1819. You tell us that this was not noticed. In the preface of your 2d edition, in the present year, you inform us, that "this is considered as a silent acknowledgment that, in the opinion of the clergy generally, the work is unanswerable: otherwise, being so often and so respectfully called upon to consider the doctrine and arguments here advanced, and point out the errors, if there be any, it is difficult to account for their silence on this subject." Subsequently, in page 198, you inform us in a note, that your principles were published in New Hampshire, in 1805, and New-York, 1816. "And at each publication the learned clergy have been respectfully called upon to shew wherein these statements are incorrect. They

have not seen fit to do it, and it is believed, for this good reason, because they know the statements are true." Accordingly, in the preface of this 2d edition, "The author," "once more, respectfully invites and entreats the clergy of other denominations, or some one of them, the more learned the better, to discuss this important subject with him; and to point out to him and the public, the supposed errors of the following work."

When your friends witness your great anxiety to submit your sentiments to unlimited investigation by word or writing, in private or in public, they admire and praise your candour and magnanimity, in proportion as they condemn our reluctance to encounter you. It is to be hoped that we shall not now change sides, and that a willingness on our part shall not cool your ardour for the contest. If God spare my life, it appears probable that I shall labour for some time in the city. Without any claims to superior learning, I do, *after prayer* and mature deliberation, feel disposed to *comply* with your reasonable requisition, and to gratify your repeated and urgent entreaties for a public discussion. That this may be prosecuted to advantage, it should be done in an orderly manner, according to a plan previously arranged. If you agree to such a measure, I should be glad, if, in your answer to this letter, you would give me the precise point which you mean to defend, in opposition to the absolute eternity of the sinner's future punishment. Do you plead for the annihilation of the wicked, as the Destructionists do? Do you believe in their restoration to heaven after being punished in hell? And if so, do you believe this punishment to be gratuitous, disciplinary, penitentiary, or satisfactory? Or do you believe that they are all, without going to hell, saved at death, or at the general resurrection, after receiving condign punishment on earth, or after receiving, not a condign, but a gratuitous, a penitentiary, or a disciplinary punishment? It is hoped that your answer, as soon as convenient, will prepare the way for a speedy meeting.

W. L. M'CALLA.

Philadelphia, 69, *North Third-street*. *July* 2, 1824.

Mr. Abner Kneeland.

No. 3.

Mr. M'CALLA,

Your letter of July 2d was received during my absence. I returned from New York last evening, and embrace the

first opportunity this morning to reply. You are under an entire mistake, sir, in supposing that I have "privately and publicly given verbal and written invitations to the clergy in general to defend their faith in public debate." I have never solicited a public debate with any man, either clergyman or layman, unless what I have written in the preface to the second edition to my lectures can be so construed. And even there the discussion is limited to the supposed errors of that work; at the same time nothing is said about a public debate. My ideas are before the public, in print, and if any important errors are contained in them, I expect they will be pointed out to me and the public in the same way; namely, from the press. That I have discussed some important doctrinal points with laymen, in a society instituted for that purpose, is true; and I wish to have it distinctly understood, that while I have never solicited a public debate with any man, I have never declined one, and should I now come in "contact" with a clergyman, in this way, it would not be the first time. What I have solicited, is to have the supposed errors of my Lectures pointed out: If that is to be the subject, the discussion must be limited to what is there written.

Should the subject of the Lectures be waived, (to which I have no objection,) I should come to the main question at once, namely, Does the law of God require that sin, committed here in time, and in this state of mortality, should be punished in eternity, or beyond *death*, meaning to be understood by that term, a dissolution of this mortal existence? I shall deny the existence of any such law, and consequently of any such punishment. Hence we should have no occasion to discuss either the nature or the duration of punishment, unless the *fact* can first be proved. I shall contend, however, that no punishment, as coming from God will be incompatible with infinite and divine love to the individual that is punished. A. KNEELAND.

Philadelphia, 31 *South Second st. July* 7, 1824.

Mr. W. L. M'Calla.

No. 4.

Mr. KNEELAND,

Yours of yesterday has been duly received. You inform me that you have "never solicited a public debate with any man," though you "have never declined one;" and that you

have, before now, come in contact, in this way, both with the laity and the clergy. As you profess a willingness to do the same again, we will leave the community to judge whether all that you have said and done, and written and published, will amount to an invitation or not.

As we have soon agreed to meet, the preliminary regulations need not occasion much delay. I would propose the following.

Rules of conference adopted and signed this day of 1824, in the city of Philadelphia, by Abner Kneeland and W. L. M'Calla. Duplicates given to the parties.

1. The proposition for discussion shall be as follows, viz. Is the future punishment of the wicked absolutely eternal? or is it only a temporal punishment in this world, for their good, and to be succeeded by eternal happiness after death?

2. Each speaker shall be entitled to an alternate address of thirty minutes, and no longer, unless the other party waive his right.

3. The discussion shall be moderated by three men, each of the parties choosing one, and these two a third, who shall be considered the President of the Bench.

4. The discussion shall (God willing,) commence on the inst. at the Church, at half past 9 o'clock, A. M. and continue, if necessary until noon. It shall, if necessary, be resumed at 4, and continued until half after 6, and so on from day to day until both parties are satisfied.

5. The debate shall be opened and closed by one party in the forenoon and another in the afternoon. And in case of a continuance, the party who relinquished this privilege on the morning of the first day, shall, if requiring it, enjoy it on the morning of the second; and so on.

The only difficulty likely to occur in the consideration of the above rules is in the first of them, which settles the subject of discussion. In your letter you propose a question for debate, without which you say "we should have no occasion to discuss either the nature or the duration of punishment." To this I answer that the duration of punishment is the very point in question between us, and the only one on

which I am willing to meet you: and of course I should not wish to turn my attention to one which would exclude it. This is the very feature which distinguishes the Universalists from other sects. And remember, Sir, that you are called a Universalist preacher, your book is on universal benevolence, and it was addressed to the Universalist church. The fact that this book treats principally on the *duration of punishment*, was the reason of its invitation being accepted. If it should now be postponed for another, you may afterward introduce another and another without end. Some would suspect this to be a plan of procuring an indefinite postponement of a question which you profess a great willingness to discuss.

But let us see whether you have not done injustice to your own question. Without its accompanying explanation it reads as follows; viz. "Does the law of God require that sin committed here in time, and in this state of mortality should be punished in eternity or beyond death?" This is a question about eternal punishment; and how you could investigate it, and at the same time "have no occasion to discuss either the nature or the *duration* of punishment," I am at a loss to know. *The duration of punishment* is the very jet of the question, and I would freely undertake to discuss it, were it not for the very reason which (as some would suspect) induced you to propose it. That reason is, that this question is an attempt to preclude me from the benefit of all but one argument, and that thought to be the weakest one of many arguments by which our opinion is supported. You would not permit me to confine you to one argument any more than to one text, and a persevering attempt to do either would be easily understood by those friends who have so long admired your polemical prowess.

The question as stated in the above rules does justice to you and myself. It trammels neither, but leaves each at liberty to manage his cause in his own way. It is hoped, therefore, that there will be no farther difficulty about the investigation of questions confessedly irrelevant to the subject; especially as the discussion of such questions was never made a pre-requisite to your former debates with either laymen or clergymen.

As the young men's Missionary Society have sent me an appointment which may soon be accepted, it is but right to inform you that this correspondence was undertaken on my

own motion, after asking counsel of God, and of course, is not to be considered as attaching any responsibility to the Missionary Society or to the Clergy of the city.

W. L. M'CALLA.

Philadelphia, 69 *North Third-st. July* 8, 1824.

Mr. Abner Kneeland.

No. 5.

Mr. CALLA,

Yours of this morning, proposing a conference, or public debate, has been received, and now lays before me. I hereby accept your proposals, and agree to the arrangement, with the exception of a single word in the first proposition, a word entirely unnecessary on your part, and which involves a main question with me. I mean the word "future" in connection with punishment. The reason why I wish to exclude this word from the proposition, may be obvious: the terms "future punishment" are so generally understood to mean a punishment in another world; it would seem that I had admitted the fact of the existence of such punishment, by agreeing to discuss its duration, a doctrine which but few Universalists believe, and which is not contained (but proofs to the contrary are contained) in my Lectures. You must be sensible, sir, that it will be altogether nugatory to talk about the duration of punishment in another world, until we have good evidence that such punishment either does, or will, at some future period, exist. I do not deny you the use of any evidence, or any arguments which go to establish this fact; but unless, sir, you are prepared to prove this, namely, the certainty of punishment in another world, that is, in another state of existence, you must, I think, be sensible that you cannot prove that punishment is "absolutely eternal."

In order to fix on time and place, and make such other arrangements as may be necessary, have the goodness to call on me this afternoon at 5 o'clock, or as soon as convenient.

A. KNEELAND.

Thursday, 3 *o'clock, P. M.*

No. 6.

The Rules of Conference adopted and signed by the parties may be seen in No. 16, where they are introduced by a Universalist preamble, which, though written over my name, was no more my own production than the speeches which Mr. Jennings has attributed to me.

No. 7.

FROM THE DEMOCRATIC PRESS OF JULY 20; 1824.

We had not intended to have taken any notice of the late Theological Controversy which took place in this city, but a friend having taken the trouble to prepare the following we do not feel at liberty to set it aside, whatever may be our unwillingness or reluctance to publish any thing which may savour of religious disputation or sectional prejudices.

FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PRESS.

M'CALLA *vs.* KNEELAND.

"If I am right, thy grace impart,
Still in the right to stay;
If I am wrong, O teach my heart,
To find that better way."

Mr. Editor.—

The dispute between the above named gentlemen which continued for four days, which was concluded this evening, Friday; I presume is no news to you. To give some account of this strange controversy, or I should more properly call it this novel mode of conducting a religious controversy, I devoted a few minutes after retiring from the scene of action, (the Universalist Church in Lombard street) hoping that it may be agreeable to your readers both in "town and country" to know something about this spirit stirring affair which has brought both ends of our town together, day after day, since the discussion commenced.

The subject of debate between the Rev. Mr. M'Calla of the Presbyterian persuasion, from Kentucky, and the Rev Mr. Kneeland, Universalist, of this city, was whether there is, or is not, a "*State of Future and Eternal Punishment.*"

The mode of dividing the time between the speakers had been previously agreed on; each was to have half an hour alternately, until the disputants or subject was exhausted. The debate began, and was continued, with all the earnestness, learning and zeal of the opponents. Every text, or perhaps nearly every text, was cited for or against, which is to be found in the inspired volume, and commented on in some shape or other. I think it proper not to say fully discussed, for it was declared this morning that the Church would be closed after to-day, and Mr. M'Calla had not, nor could not, get through his argument as he had originally intended to pursue it. He however abridged his comments in order to finish in the required time. In the course of this long debate there certainly was a handsome display of Biblical erudition on both sides, as well as good logical argument; but in the early part of the dispute there was one illiberal taunt against the "raw backwoods Kentuckian to undertake to

teach theology in Philadelphia" which caused considerable asperity in reply, and was not forgotten through the whole debate. The Kentuckian not only proved himself a zealous servant of his Master, a good theologian and an able debater, but also a good Greek, Hebrew and Latin scholar, and well read in the fathers of the Church.

At half past six o'clock on Friday evening the contest closed. Mr. Kneeland reiterated many of his favourite texts, made a last and powerful appeal for the reason, plausibility and mercy of his doctrine, and concluded by insisting that his construction of Divine Law was the true and catholic gospel of Christ. Mr. M'Calla had the last half hour, and concluded the debate by a concise recapitulation of some of his strongest proofs in support of his opinions. His peroration was really excellent, solemn and impressive; his reasoning was sound and irrefutable. A description I cannot attempt; the whole will be printed I presume, but the reader will not, nay, I had almost said, cannot, have an adequate idea of the intense zeal and fervour of the speaker, to instill into every mind the BLESSED TRUTH.

The disputants shook hands and separated with perfect good will towards each other as men, though as widely differing as Christians as when they first met. The immense crowd of spectators also separated in a very peaceable quiet manner.

PAUL.

No. 8.

Paul was answered by a Vestryman who denied that I had been excluded from the church. In the Democratic Press of July 24th, he replies; after which Mr. Kneeland, in the same paper, of the 27th, confirms the account of the Vestryman.

FROM THE DEMOCRATIC PRESS, JULY 24.

M'CALLA AND KNEELAND ONCE MORE.

Mr. Editor—You will confer a favour by inserting the following brief reply to "A Member of the Vestry," and you may rest assured that I shall not trouble you again on this subject.

The following sentence which I still aver to be substantially true, is roundly pronounced *false* by the *vestry man;*—"It was declared this morning [meaning Friday morning,] that the church would be closed after to-day, and Mr. M'Calla had not, nor could not, get through his argument, as he had originally intended to pursue it." Now I say words were never plainer spoken than these were by Mr. Kneeland, that "this house (meaning the Universalist Church,) could not be promised after

to-day, (Friday last) for the purpose of continuing this debate." Yet it is said no such declaration was made! and still it is admitted, Mr. M'Calla "*tried to insinuate that such had been the fact.*" Those who heard this controversy know full well that Mr. M'Calla did not indulge in insinuation in this instance, but plainly regretted that his time had been, contrary to agreement, prescribed. It is true when Mr. Kneeland replied to the regrets of his opponent, he did say, for ought he knew the church could be obtained for a month, if required so long: "*but that it did not belong to him, he had no control over it,*" and it did not suit a "A member of the Vestry," at that time to say any thing about it, therefore it must be closed as before stated, and it was closed accordingly.

No person will, I presume, have hardihood enough to deny that Abner Kneeland had not the same control over the church he had when the *Rules of Conference* were adopted and signed by him and his opponent. For the sake of illustrating the good faith of Mr. M'Calla's opponent I just copy the 4th and 6th articles of conference, viz:

4th The Discussion shall, God willing commence on the 13th inst. at half past 9 o'clock A. M. and continue if necessary, ununtil noon. It shall be resumed if necessary at 4 o'clock, and continue until half past 6. P. M. and continue from day to day until both parties shall be satisfied.

6th The conference to be held at the Universalist Church in Lombard-st. *and adjourned by mutual consent to some other suitable place.*

Thus we perceive instead of an adjournment by mutual consent, the adjournment take place *nolens volens*, without any consultation about it. After this it is to be hoped those "Challenges for disputation to the learned clergy, the more learned the better, of more than 20 years standing," will be withdrawn.

The vestry man says, "No declaration, therefore was made on either side, *except* what was made by Mr. Kneeland and Mr. M'Calla." No one ever said there was. Mr. Kneeland and Mr. M'Calla are the only persons the public know any thing about, they have said all, and done all that has been said or done, in this affair; so he, very unwittingly concedes all he had just been stoutly denying. In his N. B. he requests that public opinion may be suspended on the merits of the discussion. The merits of the discussion are to prove or disprove a *state of future and eternal punishment*, and in my humble opinion to those who read their Bibles, and have or even have not heard the debate cannot be thought to judge prematurely on a matter so plain to all but those who are detertimed to PUT OFF THE LAW OF GOD.

PAUL.

No. 9.

The following Letters passed between Mr. M'Calla and Mr. Kneeland after the close of the foregoing Discussion:

MR. KNEELAND,

In the "Democratic Press" I observe a dispute between "PAUL" on one side, and you and "A VESTRYMAN" on the other side, whether or not I was brought to a premature close, in the discussion in Lombard-street Church. Your arguments and statements I deem incorrect. Yet one feature of your publication gives me pleasure. It is an indication of a willingness on your part to hear me until I am satisfied. You have, now, at least, given me "to understand, that in all probability, the house might be obtained as long as it should be wanted." Another meeting would give you an opportunity of answering that new matter to which you made no reply, and it would show whether my materials were exhausted or not. This would be suitable on another account: your challange which was accepted in my letter of the 2d inst. "invites and intreats the clergy" "to discuss" not only one error, but "the supposed *errors*" of your Lectures. During the debate I showed that they erred on the Divinity of Christ, and intimated a willingness to meet you at a convenient season on that point. That intimation is now renewed. If you still entertain the desire manifested in your repeated challenges, it can now (God willing) be gratified at the same place, with the same rules, and under the same moderation:

Your speedy answer will be a gratification to

W. L. M'CALLA.

Philadelphia, July 31, 1824.
No. 69 *North Third Street.*

MR. M'CALLA,

As our former letters are published in the "Gazetteer," and the subsequent discussion is now in the Press, I shall publish, through the same medium, yours of the 31st ult. together with this my reply.

You say that you deem my "arguments and statements" to be "incorrect;" but you have not informed me to what arguments you allude, nor wherein my statements have been incorrect. This is reprehensible. No man ought to be charged with having made incorrect statements, without being informed, at the same time, wherein.

Although I had pledged myself, and was determined to hear you through at that time, yet I have given no pledge to meet you again in the same way; and whether I do, must depend on cir-

cumstances which are first to be considered.—As the Church in Lombard street, in which we held our late discussion, has been since, (at considerable expense,) both cleaned and repaired, I am not able to say whether it could be so soon obtained again for a similar purpose.

As to the new matter to which I had not an opportunity to reply, (Ps. ix. 5.) since it makes nothing in your favour, nor against any of my arguments, a bare note of a very few lines, will be all the reply I shall need.

Whether your materials were all exhausted or not, is a matter of no consequence; for if you could spend *four days* without the least attempt to reply to either my first or second argument, both of which were presented in my first speech, (to neither of which did you attempt any reply,) you probably might continue a month in the same way; and, after all, to no purpose.

If you wish to discuss the "supposed errors" of my Lectures, you must do it in the way the challenge (as you call it) was given, namely, through the medium of the press; for, as those Lectures have been so long before the public, I shall discuss that subject in no other way: nor, unless you are able to point out errors which are material and important in point of doctrine or fact, do I pledge myself to reply. You have *said* that there were errors in my Lectures, but you have not yet *shown* any. I did not think proper to contradict what you was pleased to say about them during the discussion, (except when you tried to pervert a single sentence,) and it was for this plain reason,—because they were not mentioned in the proposition for discussion.

Now, sir, I wish you distinctly to understand, notwithstanding whatever you may say about challenges, that before I will consent to debate with a man on any religious subject whatever, at any time or place, who has not only refused to unite with me in religious worship, but who has refused to give me his hand when mine was extended to him in token of friendship, in my own desk, he must give me satisfactory evidence that the clergy with whom he is connected, and with whom he professes to be in fellowship, however much they may disapprove of his conduct in this particular, nevertheless consider him as a brother in the faith, and approve of his mode of arguing on religious subjects. This, with me, is a *sine qua non*, and unless it be complied with, it will be useless to urge any thing further on the subject.

If I meet a man to discuss religious subjects before the public, I must meet him on the *level*;—he is not to have the privilege of assuming that he is a christian, and that his antagonist is an infidel, until he has proved, both from theory and practice, that such is the fact.—I ask, in this case, no more than what I am willing to give, should it be required.—Or, let your friends open the doors of one of their Churches, to accommodate the au-

dience, as mine have done, and I will consider it a satisfactory evidence that they are with you in this debate.

These preliminaries being settled, the first thing in order to be attended to, is, what has been already proposed.

1. You must show the law of God which requires "absolutely eternal punishment," or else acknowledge that no such law has been given to man.

2. You must show that God has threatened man, through the medium of his prophets, with a punishment which is "absolutely eternal," or else acknowledge that you cannot.

3. You must prove, from the New Testament, that there will be the *wicked*, (Ps. xxxvii. 10,) and, of course, a punishment for the wicked, after this mortal shall have put on immortality, or after that death is swallowed up of life, or acknowledge that you cannot.

4. No evidence will be admitted as a proof of a punishment between death and the resurrection, that is, in what is called an *intermediate state*, unless you can first prove that the soul or *spirit of man* (whatever you may understand by those terms) is *susceptible* of consciousness, and of course, of happiness or misery, independent of the organs of sense, or seperate from a body.

5. I, on my part, will prove the latter part of our former proposition true, and that all mankind will ultimately be saved from sin, and consequently from punishment, or else acknowledge that I cannot.

6. It shall be mutually agreed, that the moment either wanders from the point in debate, in the opinion of either two of the moderators, he shall be stopped; and unless he will confine himself to the subject, in proper and decorous language, he shall not be allowed to proceed.

7. The moderators to be the same as on the last day of our former discussion, or such as may be mutually agreed upon.

With these regulations, and as many of the former as are not inconsistent with these, I should have no objection to continue the discussion till every point is fully settled, if practicable.

A. KNEELAND.

No. 31, *South Second Street,*
August 2, 1824.

No. 11.

In the Franklin Gazette of Aug. 23d, the following letter appeared, which was afterward copied into the Democratic Press of September 2d.

DEBATE ON UNIVERSALISM.

FOR THE FRANKLIN GAZETTE.

TO MR. ABNER KNEELAND.

Sir:—In my letter of the 31st ultimo, published in the Gazette of Monday, a plan was proposed for bringing the dispute between you and Paul, a writer in the Democratic Press, to a speedy settlement;—for giving you an opportunity of answering my new matter;—for securing to me the stipulated privilege of speaking until satisfied;—and of discussing with you, (if you thought proper,) the doctrine of Christ's divinity, on which subject your lectures afford another of those errors, for the discussion of which you have challenged the clerical world.

In your answer of the 2d instant, published also by you on yesterday, you intimate that it is unimportant whether I spoke until satisfied or not;—unimportant that you should answer the new matter;—and inadmissable that we should hold an *ore tenis* investigation of the divinity of Christ. Although your printed challenge is still standing, and your pulpit challenges are still uttered, you decline another meeting. Since the debate, you have altered your course. Whether this has arisen from a change in your views of policy or of propriety, the public must judge. Let it be however distinctly understood, that it is not the orthodox clergy, but Mr. Kneeland, the man of challenging memory, who retires from investigation. Whether your stenographical squire, the ostensible Editor of the pretended "Minutes" of the discussion, will, with your assistance, succeed better from the press than you have done from the rostrum, is problematical.

To a second meeting you object the expense of *cleaning* the house. It was never before graced with a greater proportion of females and respectable characters.

But you say that the house has been since *repaired*, and, therefore, although you were willing to continue the former debate, you think a second interview impracticable. Strange, that in a state of repair, a house cannot hold an overwhelming congregation, as well as when it has begun, to give way! Until after the debate was closed, I did not know that the building, though propped on the last day, was ready to fall in ruins on the audience. Notwithstanding this, you have intimated to the public, that it might then have been obtained longer. Yet as it has since

been repaired, and there is little reason to expect that it will fall, we cannot have it again but must procure another church!

Your insisting that I should finish from the press a discussion which was begun in conference, shows that, you are learning by experience. With the help of God, you shall be satisfied here also.

As you are unwilling to have your flight from the controversy viewed in its real character, you propose new terms of conference. Three of your requisitions are, that I shall prove eternal punishment from the law, the prophets, and the New Testament. Without by any means, admitting that this is impracticable, it may be correctly observed that no man who believes in the inspiration of Scripture will reject any doctrine or precept, merely because it is not revealed by every inspired writer. Abundant testimony from the Old and New Testament was advanced in the debate. Yet, as you arrogate to yourself, though a party, the sole right of judging of my evidence; and as you have already decided that the Old Testament gives no intimation even of a future state, this demand for proof from that quarter was only intended as an insurmountable obstacle to another meeting.

The same general features characterize your fourth demand, requiring proof that the soul *can* exist separate from the body, before you will admit even the testimony of Moses and the prophets and the apostles, that it *does* so exist; as if infallible proof of the *fact* itself did not at once establish the *possibility* of the fact. You might as well say, that before you will admit scriptural testimony of the existence of God, this must first be proved from reason, independently of revelation. Although sound reason is entirely consistent with revelation, none but an infidel will give it paramount authority.

Our relative standing in this businness may be plainly shown by the following supposed case: A Kentucky duellist, a character far too common, publishes a general challenge, and repeats it often. Suppose that the last edition reads as follows: "He once more respectfully invites and entreats the gentlemen of other states, or some one of them, the more expert the better, to exchange a few shots with him." Suppose that an eastern merchant, not scrupulous about the sixth commandment, is in Lexington on business, and meets him on his own premises. After four rounds, the Kentuckian, faint for the loss of blood, gives a hint to his antagonist, that they cannot probably occupy the ground any longer. They part, but after the invitation is again repeated and accepted, the Kentuckian demurs to the former regulations, and insists upon many new conditions, among which the following are four: 1. The lock of his antagonist's weapon must come from Europe. 2. The stock must come from

Asia. 3. The barrel must come from Africa. 4. No fire-arms will be admitted in this contest, unless you can first prove to my satisfaction that a man may be killed at the distance of ten steps, by the use of the ramrod alone, independently of powder and lead, and separate from the pistol. On hearing these demands, would not the eastern gentleman conclude that the backwoodsman was not yet recovered from his wounds? He would ask, why were not these conditions considered necessary to the first encounter? Of what importance is it where the weapon was manufactured, or how it is compounded, provided it is a lawful one? And why should it then be laid aside for something else?

Where you obtained a right to choose weapons for your antagonist as well as yourself, I cannot conceive. If it belong to either party, it is rather to the one who has accepted, than to the one who gave the challenge. Although analogy would decide that you have forfeited your claim in my favor, I thank God that I neither desire nor need exclusive privileges. They cannot be secured to you nor to me, by the principles of propriety, nor by the usages of theological polemics. You are at perfect liberty to choose your own position, and your own manner of defending it. If you choose, you may again ride into the field on the shoulders of Dr. Priestly, clothed in all the beauties of the improved version, covered from head to foot with such arms and accoutrements as your many Latin versions and Hutter's Polyglott. You may again tell the people how many languages you can read, and how many you cannot read, (alas!) for the want of Lexicons and grammars. While you set yourself off to the best advantage, you shall be at perfect liberty again to ridicule my country, my talents, and my pronunciation. You may also laugh again at my poor little unbound book of notes; while you smilingly shew to the assembly your *miniature Testament* with its *new coat!* You may as before, wander from the point whenever you please; and have great latitude, in repetitions, absurdities and sarcasms. You may again try every possible artifice to drive or to decoy me from the question in debate, and when you have failed, you may (as before) spend the other half of your time in complaining that I have never yet come to the point. These things should convince you that I am willing to accept your invitation on liberal principles, while you are *afraid* to prosecute your own challenge without very unfair advantages.

Your letter informs me moreover that we cannot again meet unless we are on the *level;*—unless I prove my christianity;—unless I am virtually re-ordained;—and unless I give you the right hand of fellowship.

Since our debate the duties on orthodoxy appear to be rising.

As this policy is intended to exclude that article from the market, the distinguishing features of your new polemical tariff deserve particular attention.

1. You say, "If I meet a man to discuss religious subjects before the public, I must meet him on the *level*." Many are at a loss for your meaning. Do you mean that you would more easily find your level among the unfledged disputants of your little debating societies; or among heretical teachers, whom the christian church has never acknowledged in any age? If so, your prudence may be commended, though not your piety. The words immediately following the above quotation seem rather to contradict than explain it. They are the following: "and he is not to have the privilege of assuming that he is a christian, and that his antagonist is an infidel, until he has proved both from theory and practice that such is the fact." To place us upon a *level*, then, in your view, I must prove myself a christian and you an infidel! This absurdity is not surprising in a man who has labored hard, as you have, to prove that Lazarus in Abraham's bosom, and the rich man in torment, were on a *level*.

2. Whether you meant the words last quoted as an illustration of the immediately preceding context or not, they require me to produce proof of my christianity in doctrine and practice. But who is to be the judge in this matter? As you are not satisfied with the decisions of many congregations and judicatories of the church, you would probably like, previous to meeting me again, to sit in judgment yourself upon my character. As you have, in common with other infidels, a great esteem for Dr. Priestly's "learning and piety;" and as you have, in your lectures, decidedly expressed this sentiment, and earnestly recommended his "History of the Corruptions of Christianity" to your readers; it is easy to see that you would pronounce me an impious idolater, and no christian. For this we need go no farther than a sermon preached by him, in the year 1796, in the church where our debate took place. For the proof of its doctrines he refers to the history mentioned above. In it he would persuade us that Christ is a mere creature, like Moses, or even the idol Baal. And he expressly declares, that "it is no less idolatry and impiety to worship him," than to worship them! In speaking of the corruptions that were left untouched at the reformation, he declares "that the first and the greatest of these corruptions is the idolatrous *worship of Jesus Christ*, as God equal to the Father." The Father he declares to be "the sole object of religious worship, and not Christ, any more than Moses, or any other person or being whatever."

It is not surprising that such a man should deny the inspiration of the Scriptures. In his History of the Corruptions of Christianity, which you have "earnestly" recommended to

your readers, he says, (and you virtually say with him,) that Paul wrote "without any particular inspiration," and that "the Scriptures were written without any particular inspiration." To be approved as *a christian in theory*, by such men as you and Dr. Priestly, it is necessary, then, that I should deny the divinity and atonement of Christ, and the inspiration of the Scriptures. From such *theory* it is easy to tell what sort of practice you would demand. This subject may receive some illustration hereafter, from your publications and those of your universalist coadjutor, concerning our debate. As, during that contest, I persisted in quoting your lectures, although you were thoroughly ashamed of them, you must excuse me if I now insist upon your connexion with a stenographer of whom you are as much ashamed. That you have reason to be so shall hereafter be fully proved, if Providence permit.

3. You appear to demand that I shall be ordained by the body of the Presbyterian clergy to the special work of contending with you, or I shall not enjoy this enviable privilege again. You require satisfactory evidence that they consider me as a brother in the faith, and approve of my mode of arguing on religious subjects. As the demand was made only to cover your retreat, the best evidence would not be satisfactory to you. That I had the approbation and the prayers of all the orthodox of all denominations who were present, is well known to yourself: And you well know from my being a member of the last general assembly, that the Presbyterians consider me a brother in the faith. Can you give the evidence which you here demand of me? Do you not know that some universalists of the Winchester stamp discard you as an infidel? Did you not know that others of your own sentiments lamented that you made so lame a defence, and wished that Mr. Mitchell of New York, (except for his irritability,) or Mr. Ballou of Boston, had occupied your place in the controversy? If I were afraid, here is a *sine qua non* of your own invention, under which to take shelter.

On a former occasion, you made pathetic complaints of a pretended combination of the clergy against you. In your debate. you made what you could of my standing alone; telling the audience that I could not find a ministerial second in the city. Failing in this, you resort now to the old plan, and determine on not moving a step farther in the business until such a combination is formed, in order to increase your importance, and add pungency to your complaints. Whenever you will show satisfactory evidence that you have been appointed as an approved advocate of unitarianism or infidelity, by the University of Cambridge, or Transylvania, or the College of South Carolina, then may you demand of an antagonist, special Presbyterial or synodical credentials, and then shall you have them. But do not ex-

pect that our ecclesiastical ocean is going to rise in its majesty "to waft a feather or to drown a fly."

4. You object to meeting a man who has refused to join with you in religious worship; and who has refused to give you his hand in your *own desk*. During the debate, we were informed by yourself that it was your *own desk;* which, of course, induced me to close reluctantly when you told us that the house could not *probably be* procured another day. Yet this was not done without repeated declarations that I could not complete my defence in the time allowed me. I am glad, however, that you have publicly complained of my refusing you my hand in this famous desk of yours, since it has been incorrectly reported by one or more of your followers that I afterwards repented of this act. Immediately after the debate, you requested me to give you my hand as a man, since I could not do it as a christian. As this was only an emphatical way of rejecting your claims to christianity, I complied; and in doing so made an express and repeated denial of your christianity. For *refusing* to give you my hand, the Apostle John is my precedent, and his disciple, Polycarp, for my subsequent *compliance* with your request. *John* rejected your unitatarian ancestor Cerinthus, as "the enemy of God;" and Polycarp acknowledged your relative Marcion, as "the first born of the devil."

But why should the unqualified eulogist of Dr. Priestly be so anxious to join in worship with trinitarians? This very man, "whose learning and piety" you so much admire, and whose writings you so "*earnestly* recommend" to your readers, has declared in your *own desk* that "no unitarian can conscientiously join in worship with trinitarians, since they have not the same object of worship." He declares "that they cannot conscientiously join in the devotions of others, who, believing both Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit to be, each of them, possessed of all divine attributes, as well as the Father, make them, (as to be consistent with themselves they ought to do,) equally the objects of their worship. This unitarians necessarily consider as idolatry, as much as the worship of the Virgin Mary, or any other saints in the Popish calender." Why should you wish to worship with trinitarians, when, with your oracle, the *charitable* Mr. Ballou, you think that you "find them causing their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire to a God which is the vanity of their imaginations?" And recollect, sir, that notwithstanding your evasions during the debate, those lectures of yours, which you are so anxious to preserve from another castigation, will ever fix upon you the same sentiments.

Great as your pretentions are to liberality and chatholicism, you there represent us as the antichristian votaries of a God, with whose character you say that we "associate all the charac-

ter of the ferocious *Beast*" of the Apocalypse. To such persons you pretend that you are doing "the greatest possible kindness, by pointing out to them the CRUELTY OF THEIR GOD and the ABOMINATION OF ALL SUCH WORSHIP." These, sir, are your own words concerning the right worship of the true God by his faithful people. And yet, after this licentious traduction of their character, you pretend great solicitude to join with *such* a people in *such* a worship to *such* a God!

W. L. M'CALLA.

Philadelphia, August 22, 1824.

No. 12.

The above letter received the following notice in the two papers, of August 27th, and September 4th.

FOR THE FRANKLIN GAZETTE.

Mr. NORVELL:—I notice in your paper of the 23d istant, a long letter addressed to me, and signed "W. L. M'CALLA," which he probably expects me to answer; but as Mr. M'Calla has not complied with any of the terms on which it was proposed to him that the discussion between us might be renewed, I have no occasion to answer his long letter; being, as I am, perfectly willing to submit to the reasonableness of my propositions, and the candor of his rejoinder, to a discerning and judicious public.

A. KNEELAND.

Philadelphia, August 27, 1824.

[COMMUNICATION.]

Mr. BINNS:—I noticed in your paper of Thursday a communication from Mr. W. L. M'Calla, which had previously appeared in the Franklin Gazette; in answer to it, I have only to refer you to the letters that passed between Mr. M'C. and myself, that were published in that Gazette of the 23d ultimo, and afterwards in your own paper; in which it will be perceived, that I have offered to meet Mr. M'C. again (or in other words, have accepted his challenge) on condition that his friends will open one of their churches to accommodate the audience (as proof that they approve of his manner of conducting an argument) together with some other conditions therein named, not one of which has he complied with. Until therefore he shall comply with those conditions, or others equally fair, I have nothing more to say to him on the subject.

Respectfully, A. KNEELAND.

Philadelphia, Sept. 3, 1824.

No. 13.

The Universalist Magazine, of August 28, sent to me from Boston contained the following:

FOR THE UNIVERSALIST MAGAZINE.

THE REV. MR. M'CALLA.

The public attention has, for some time, been excited by the movements of this gentleman, in Philadelphia. We have seen an account of his challenging the Rev. Mr. Kneeland to a public debate on the question whether the doctrine of endless misery be true; of Mr. Kneeland's acceptance; of the debate which was continued from day to day, until discontinued by mutual consent. We are further certified by what Mr. Kneeland has since published, that neither he nor his friends were in any degree convinced that the doctrine of endless misery is a doctrine of divine revelation; but contrary to this, we understand that it is their opinion that the challenger was never able to substantiate any thing which is essential to his doctrine, nor refute a single proposition which is necessarily connected with the doctrine of Universal Salvation. As much as the foregoing is well understood by many.

When I was at Hartford, Conn. last week, to attend the dedication of a new universalist meeting house in that City, and the installation of the Rev. Mr. Bisbe, I had the pleasure of seeing, among other faithful brethren, the Rev. Mr. Mitchell, from the City of New York. He showed me a letter which he had recently received, from the Rev. Mr. M'Calla, of Philadelphia, which informed Mr. Mitchell, that Mr. M'Calla had beaten Mr. Kneeland off from the strong delusion of universalism, and that he wished to wait on Mr. Mitchell in New York for the purpose of publickly refuting him, and of convincing his congregation. When this letter was read in Hartford, I told Mr. Mitchell that, it confirmed me in the opinion to which I was inclined on reading this clergyman's challenges, which were addressed to Mr. Kneeland in Philadelphia; which was, that from some cause, the man was not exactly in his right mind. I think Mr. Mitchell and others, of good judgment, agreed with me on this subject.

The evening that I arrived in Boston, I received the following letter, which sufficiently corroborates the opinion which I had before formed, of Mr. M'Calla's misfortune.

LETTER.

Philadelphia, August 13, 1824.

Rev. Sir,

I have recently had a debate in public with Rev. Abner Kneeland, and as the public generally have concluded, have completely beaten my opponent. I am now desirous, sir, of break-

ing a lance with you upon some other tenet of the Universalists, such as may mutually be agreed upon; and should like to commence the same in some public place in your City, either your house of worship or some City hall as soon as possible.—Will you, sir, favor me with an early reply to this, directed to No. 69, North Third street. For my character as a man of learning, I refer you to Rev. Dr. Wilson, and Rev. Dr. Ely, whose sanction in the present challenge has been obtained in writing. W. L. M'CALLA.

REMARKS.

The reason why I publish this letter and give the foregoing information is, by no means, to injure Mr. M'Calla, but to prevent, what I am very confident would be attempted, if this public notice was not given; viz. insinuations that Mr. Mitchell of New York, and Mr. Ballou of Boston, have neither of them confidence or courage to meet this man in public debate, respecting the doctrine of universal salvation.

If Mr. M'Calla was perfectly sane, he would know, that if he had beaten Mr. Kneeland, in such a way as to do any good, Mr. Kneeland or his friends, or both, would acknowledge it; for what good does it do to refute one in error, unless he, by some means, can find it out? But, if he really believes that he has convinced the Universalists of Philadelphia, that the doctrine of endless punishment is a doctrine of divine revelation; if he had his reason, would he not know that there is no need of any further public dispute, but that to publish these convincing arguments, which have settled the great question in Philadelphia, would silence universalism where ever they should be read? But he wishes to dispute with me on some other tenet of universalism; as if after he had disproved the doctrine in the gross, it becomes necessary to refute it by taking its items in detail!

But after all, if I have not judged correctly, and Mr. M'Calla is just what he thinks he is; and if the Rev. Doctors, to whom he refers are in earnest and acting understandingly in this matter, then I would say, let them accompany their champion to Boston and stand by him while he shall publicly refute the doctrine of God's universal, impartial goodness, and prove that the God of all grace is unmercifully cruel, and I will engage, when all this is done, to give up my hope in divine mercy, and join these Rev. divines in the doctrine of despair. But before this, I promise to use my feeble powers to the utmost in defence of the gospel. HOSEA BALLOU.

No. 14.

September the 1st, Mr. Kneeland published the following.

FROM THE FRANKLIN GAZETTE.

TO MR. HOSEA BALLOU, OF BOSTON.

SIR.—I have just seen a publication in "the Universalist Magazine" of your city, for August 28, 1824, over your name, in which you give a letter, purporting to be from the Rev. W. L. M'CALLA. That letter makes Mr. M'CALLA say, "for my character as a man of learning, I refer you to the Rev. Dr. WILSON and the Rev. Dr. ELY, whose sanction in the present challenge has been obtained in writing." I have no question but that you received from *somebody* the letter which you have published; but I am fully convinced that Mr. M'CALLA is a man of sound mind and unblemished integrity, and that he never wrote, indited, or addressed one line on any subject to you, or to Mr. MITCHELL of New York, in his life. One thing I can positively affirm, that he never consulted me about challenging any man, to any sort of contest, nor did I ever give any sanction, by writing or otherwise, to his challenging any one. Some person has put into the pretended letter of Mr. M'CALLA an absolute and infamous lie.

EZRA STILES ELY.

Philadelphia, August 30, 1824.

I suspected that the letters above alluded to might be a forgery, on my first seeing the one to Mr. B. though I am not fully convinced that they are so. What created my suspicion was the respectful appellation "Reverend," prefixed to the names of Mr. Ballou and myself. I should be able, however, to detect the forgery, if it be one, could I but see the original letters. In all his correspondence with me, Mr. M'C. never wrote any thing more than his name, which is very peculiar, and I think I should know it among five hundred. He told me, in the presence of several others, that he was so nervous he could not write. Dr. Ely says, "I am fully convinced that Mr. M'CALLA is a man of sound mind and unblemished integrity." How could a man of sound mind denounce a discussion as being altogether spurious, to which the testimony of hundreds could be obtained (if it were necessary) of its being as faithful a report as ever was made; so faithful that no one has yet been able to point out a single error affecting the arguments on either side? If he were of a sound mind, how could he say that he was denied the privilege of the house any longer, when Dr. E. knows himself to the contrary?—or, how could he say that I had sent him the first number of the discussion, and requested him to point out the errors, if there were any, when I had neither done the one nor the other? and when the very number contained on its cover a let-

ter from Mr. Jennings, the Stenographer and publisher of the work, addressed to both him and me, (as well as to Dr. Ely and the other Moderators,) requesting the same thing which was imputed to me? If Dr. Ely can reconcile all this with the gentleman of a sound mind, so be it.—Then to what motive will he impute these facts, which must stare him in the face?

A. KNEELAND.

No. 15.

PHILADELPHIA.

WEDNESDAY EVENING, Sept. 8, 1824.

TO EZRA STILES ELY, D. D.

Reverend Sir,

You are hereby respectfully requested to furnish the public with the evidence by which you were "fully *convinced* that Mr. M'Calla is a man of sound mind and unblemished integrity, and that he never *wrote, indited, or addressed one line on any subject* to [Mr. BALLOU, of Boston,] or to Mr. MITCHELL, of New York, in his life." We sometimes *presume* without any other evidence than that which the nature of the case affords: but to *presume* is one thing, and to *be convinced* is another, and a very different thing. You might presume it, because, as you say, the letter to Mr. Ballou contains "an absolute and infamous lie!" but by what evidence were you "convinced" that Mr. M'C. did not sign the letter which contains it? He has not disavowed it as yet, as I can learn, and if he had not "addressed" such a letter, would he not have been as prompt in disavowing it, as Dr. E. has been in disavowing the *lie* it contains. *Presuming*, therefore, that you possess the evidence which "fully convinced" you of the truth of the statement contained in your letter to Mr. Ballou of the 30th ultimo, in justice to Mr. M'Calla, as well as all concerned, I repeat the request that this evidence should be given to the public.

Your's, respectfully,

ABNER KNEELAND.

Philadelphia, Sept. 8, 1824.

To the Rev. EDWARD MITCHELL, of New York, and the Rev. HOSEA BALLOU, of Boston.

Reverend Gentlemen,

As the Rev. Dr. Ely "is fully convinced that Mr. M'Calla never wrote, or addressed" either of you, "on any subject," (and of course considers the letters which you have received [bearing his name] a *forgery*,) if you should be convinced, from the statement in the last number of the Gazetteer, that those

were not signed by the person whose name they bear, please to publish the evidence by which you are thus convinced, in the Gospel Herald, and Universalist Magazine, respectively; but if the fact should be otherwise, and you still suspect that they were signed by Mr. M'Calla, be so good as to send the original letters, enclosed by mail, to the Editor of the Gazetteer, that the *fact* concerning them may be known. A. K.

No. 16.

FROM THE FRANKLIN GAZETTE, OF SEPT. 9TH.

DEBATE ON UNIVERSALISM.

The Universalist Magazine of August 28, was lately sent to me from Boston, by some one who rightly supposed that such a favor would be a gratification. It contains a publication of Mr. Hosea Ballou concerning certain letters, purporting to have been written by me to him, and to Mr. Mitchell of New York. Of the former he has given us a copy, and the latter appears to have been "read in Hartford," Connecticut, for the edification of the "faithful brethren," then encamped in that memorable city. As it was a challenge to a polemical encounter, they seem, from Mr. Ballou's account, to have called a council of war, composed of himself, "Mr. Mitchell, and others of good judgment" in such matters. The subject of deliberation was momentous, and much depended upon the course which they might adopt. To fight, or not to fight; that was the question. Mr. Ballou was not so presumptuous as to attempt doing perfect justice to the talents displayed in this illustrious conclave. This work should belong to none but that genius, who has celebrated, in imperishable lines, the grand Universalist Council which met before the fall of Adam. None but Milton should attempt to say or sing the wisdom displayed on this important occasion, by the *faithful brethren*, Mr. Ballou, "Mr. Mitchell, and others of good judgment," in this Universalist Hartford convention!

For these *faithfuls* to resist the daring assault of this *infidel* invader, required much greater resources than Patrick Henry believed necessary to a successful revolt of the colonies. No wonder, then, that these choice spirits did not, like the Virginia senate, unfurl the banners of war. The lion of their forest had been bearded in his own den; or, to speak more plainly, their controversial champion had been publicly refuted in his "own desk." After having lived by challenging for many years, he was at last met so successfully that he showed his antagonist the door before his argument was closed, and has ever since refused to meet him again. When the man of Gath has fallen, who can censure his *faithful brethren* of Askelon for turning their backs?

Notwithstanding my indulgent disposition, the council have, through their spokesman, expressed an apprehension that I would publish uncharitable "*insinuations that Mr. Mitchell of New York, and Mr. Ballou of Boston, have neither of them confidence or courage to meet this man in public debate respecting the doctrine of universal salvation.*" Without, therefore, recurring to the trite excuse of Hudibras for their flight, they exerted all their powers in manufacturing a feasible apology. The challenge of this monster gave him, in their eyes, a distracted and hostile aspect, much more unequivocal than that of the great wooden horse before the walls of Troy. This did not prove that he had come from the moon; but, in their opinion, such enmity to Universalism proved that his understanding was under the influence of that planet.

Christians fight with spiritual weapons. As Unitarians, Universalists, and false professors do not covet spiritual gifts, they have generally, and in some cases successfully, adopted the plan of impeaching the intellectual character of those who stand in their way. This is usually accompanied with professions of disinterestedness, and often with compliments to the moral excellence of the intended victim. Mr. Ballou says, "the reason why I publish this letter, and give the foregoing information, is by no means to injure Mr. M'Calla." Messrs. Ballou and Kneeland endeavour to deceive their neighbours by insinuations against my character, and yet would be thought to do me no injury. "As a madman who casteth firebrands, arrows and death, so is the man that deceiveth his neighbour, and saith, am I not in sport?" When Solomon's madmen are reputed for integrity and worth, their firebrands and arrows are calculated to produce death. The reason why they are often harmless, when coming from such men as that brace of writers who have assailed me in Boston and Philadelphia, is, that in their case such insinuations are well known to be the dernier resort of disappointed ambition, error and imbecility.

Although the public were correctly informed on the 31st ultimo, that I "never wrote, indited or addressed one line on any subject" to Mr. Ballou of Boston, or to Mr. Mitchell of New York, in my life, Mr. Kneeland, with this declaration before him, republished Mr. Ballou's communication the next day, and accompanied it with approbatory remarks of his own. He condescends to acknowledge some internal evidence of forgery; but, under a pretence of great uncertainty, expresses a feeble wish to "see the original letters." As they have never yet saluted my eyes, I can join him in the wish. There is at present strong proof that their author is the same person to whom many similar epistles have been lately traced in this city. Let it be distinctly understood that this person is claimed by the Universalists.

Let Messrs. Ballou and Mitchell send his letters in company with a request for his name. Some of his letters were signed with the names of departed saints and sinners, male and female, and others with the names of living citizens of Philadelphia. The following brief specimen is inserted, omitting nothing but the address:

"DEAR SIR: The following is the best way to get a name to live according to the doctrine and Christian behavour of M'Calla, the fire and brimstone chaplain of bloody Jackson.

Learn three mile prayers and half mile graces,
With well spread hands and long wry faces;
Grunt up a solemn lengthen'd groan,
And *damn all parties* but *your own*,
I'll warrant then y'e're no deceiver,
A *steady, sturdy, staunch believer*.

CALVIN, 1824."

This universal letter writer was probably among those who thought that these eastern favorites would make a better defence of their cause than Mr. Kneeland had done, and therefore adopted a plan to which he was accustomed for bringing us together. He has *only* elicited from them an uncalled-for refusal to meet me. So true is it that "the wicked fleeth when no man pursueth." Although when Providence calls, I am willing, in his strength, to encounter a ranging bear or a ravening wolf, I am not so fond of knight errantry as to go in search of such adventures. If these Hartford worthies or any one of them had published in my neighbourhood, as Mr. Kneeland did, that "he therefore, once more respectfully invites and entreats the clergy of other denominations, or some one of them, the more learned the better, to discuss this important subject with him," I should have been as willing to accept their challenge as his. It would have savoured more of a *sound mind* if Mr. Ballou had postponed his publication until he could ascertain that I had really sent him a private invitation, or until I had issued some general challenge like that of Mr. Kneeland. But if I had been madman enough to blow such a trumpet of defiance as he has done, I hope that I should not, like him, be so *unsound* as to deny it afterwards.

In the paper in which Mr. Kneeland has copied Mr. Ballou's communication, he has also devoted more than one whole page to a publication of Mr. Morse, his moderator in our debate, against the Rev. J. M. for having advertised, as he insinuates, that I would preach in his chapel "*on* Universalism." As the notice was given after the debate, and in a presbyterian place of worship, every one would have expected, after such a notice, to hear a sermon *against* universalism, just as they would expect Mr. Morse to preach *against* presbyterianism, if they received notice *from* a universalist pulpit that he would preach *on* that *subject*; and just as Blair's sermon *on* intemperance is known

by every one to be *against* that vice. Yet this universalist grammarian is prepared to prove that nothing less than insincerity or insanity could have induced Blair, that unparallelled rhetorician, to say that he preached *on* intemperance when he preached *against* it. The privilege which Mr. Morse has enjoyed, in the instructions of so great a linguist and translator as Mr. Kneeland, may be in some measure estimated by his own words in the following extracts: viz. "When you gave the notice of his meeting, were you not sensible at the time, that he [Mr. M'Calla] intended preaching *against* universalism, and not *on* that doctrine; which last expression, according to common usage, necessarily presupposes he did intend preaching *in favour of*, and not *against*, universalism?" "Preaching *on* a doctrine is what signifies, agreeably to universal [he ought to have said *universalist*] custom, an intention to advocate or endeavor to support such doctrine, whatever that doctrine may be!" These extracts speak for themselves. It only remains for me to request Messrs Ballou, "Mitchell and others of good judgment," that when they hold their next inquest over subjects of delirium, they would examine the intellectual condition of these *faithful brethren*, one of whom has written, and the other countenanced and published, such an unmerciful assault upon the English language and common sense.

Mr. Kneeland, apprehensive of the doctrine of his universalist letter-writer, founds his impeachment of my understanding upon three new allegations, all of which have no bearing at all, except against my veracity: and if a violation of truth will constitute a madman, our public hospitals must be greatly enlarged, or the *faithful brethren of good judgment* will have to build asylums for themselves. To prove this we need not go one step farther than Mr. Kneeland's first interrogative allegation. It is as follows: "How could a man of sound mind denounce a discussion as being altogether spurious, to which the testimony of hundreds could be obtained, if it were necessary, of its being as faithful a report *as ever was made*; so faithful that no one has yet *been able* to point out a single error affecting the arguments on either side?" Mark the language of Mr. Kneeland and his hundreds of universalist witnesses: "As faithful a report *as ever was made*." Out of the millions of reports that ever were made, these persons have seen but a small number. *They* must be very willing and well trained witnesses, who will swear to what they know nothing about. Although they have never seen many more translations and grammars than reports, I have no doubt that they would be as ready to swear that Mr. Kneeland's is as faithful a translation as *ever was made*, and that Mr. Morse is as great a grammarian as Dr. Blair or any other man that *ever was made*. Let it be remembered also, that some reports

have been correct, and this one, Mr. Kneeland confesses, is, in the language, deficient in accuracy. It may be asked then, how could a man of veracity, or, to use his own phraseology, "how could a man of sound mind," attest, as he has done, that a record of a twenty hours debate, not written by himself, and confessedly inaccurate, is "as faithful a report as ever was made?" I do not inquire what judges and lawyers will say to such testimony: I ask what man on earth, but a lunatic, would believe such a witness? It is no wonder that they are rejected by our courts of justice, for they have not the fear of God before their eyes. But notwithstanding the hundreds that he pretends would come at his bidding, I do not believe that he can find one witness who will give such testimony, except Messrs. Jennings, Kneeland and Morse. As to the latter character, we have already given his criticism upon an alledged notice of the Rev. J. M. that I was to preach "on Universalism." This was published to convict Mr. M. of deception. What shall we think of the veracity of that man who can do this, after he knew that it was a notorious and well attested *fact* that on the occasion referred to, Mr M. did not leave the people in doubt, but stated at large that I was to "answer Mr. Morse's sermon, delivered on the Friday evening previous, in favour of Universal salvation?" This will appear by the following certificate.

"On the sabbath evening the 1st instant when John Magoffin notified the congregation at Union Chapel, that Mr. M'Calla would preach there on the following Thursday evening, he stated that Mr. M'Calla would then answer Mr. Morse's sermon, delivered on the Friday evening previous, in favour of universal salvation; and he then stated some erroneous sentiments taught in his books by Mr. Kneeland, such as this, that God was the author of sin; and said that Mr. Kneeland founded his sentiment of universal salvation on this notion; but he held no book or paper in his hand from which he quoted nor did he say that he then used Mr. Kneeland's own words.

Chesnut Hill, 13th August, 1824.

Christopher Yeakle,	George Rex.
Jacob Lentz	Jacob Dutwaler,
Jacob Lentz, Jr.	Henry Cress,
William Smith,	Jacob Waas,
Jacob Cress,	Francis Markoe.

The above include the signatures of the most respectable men on Chesnut-hill, and of a lay elder of this city, well known for education, piety and good sense.

Mr. Kneeland's lumping attestation of the voluminous report of his promising disciple, who, it seems, has now become an Universalist preacher, so abundantly illustrates the texture of his

conscience, that I would gladly dispense with every comment upon his *moral* sanity not imperiously called for by his own publications. These have given to the otherwise insignificant question, "who sent the challenge?" an adventitious importance. If God has graciously enabled me to receive, profess and defend an essential doctrine of christianity, I care not much to whose invitation the controversy owes its birth. I have said that he gave the first request in his printed lectures. He considers this declaration as not only evidence of moral guilt, but it is the second of his three new proofs of an unsound mind! It is not such desperate idiotisms as this that have given to the question its artificial importance.—It is his publishing to the world an acknowledgement of the fact as coming from me; which acknowledgement has that identical evidence of forgery, which Mr. Kneeland himself has discovered in the letter to Boston. This conduct was in my eye, when, in a letter to him of the 22d ultimo, I promised a further comment upon his views of christian practice. A few days before the debate, the parties, at Mr. Kneeland's house, agreed to a written notification of the meeting, for insertion in some public paper. As Mr. Kneeland was acquainted with the presses of the city, our joint advertisement was left in his hands. I did not suppose that Universalism had so far affected his understanding as to make him alter such an instrument, when exposure was the certain consequence. Yet, without my privity or authority, he did add to it the following sentence: viz. "This discussion was first proposed on the part of Mr. M'Calla, and accepted by Mr. Kneeland." To save me the trouble of noticing this conduct in the papers, I requested Mr. Kneeland to correct his own error, and inform the public that this declaration was added upon his sole responsibility. He promised to do so. His failure in the performance of this promise adds to the guilt of the original transgression.

Although this article was understood to be by consent, yet as we had neglected to sign it, it did not fully answer Mr. Kneeland's purpose. He therefore took our rules of conference, an instrument which we *had* signed, and this infatuated man deliberately prefixed to them a similar declaration, in such a manner, that on the face of the paper, as published in the Saturday Evening Post of July 10, this manufactured preamble of his appears as manifestly to be signed by me, as the title of the rules, or any article which they contain. To show this, we here insert the publication in its primitive beauty, with Mr. Kneeland's unauthorized introduction, enclosed in brackets.

"[PUBLIC THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION.

"After the interchange of two letters on each side, the first of which, dated July 2d, coming from the Reverend Mr. M'Calla,

and proposing a public debate which, being accepted by the Reverend Mr. Kneeland, led to a meeting of the parties, when the following articles were mutually agreed upon.]"

Rules of Conference adopted and signed this eighth day of July; 1824, in the city of Philadelphia, by Abner Kneeland and W. L. M'Calla. (Duplicates given to the parties.)

1. The proposition for discussion shall be as follows, viz. Is the punishment of the wicked absolutely eternal? or is it only a temporal punishment in this world, for their good, and to be succeeded by eternal happiness after death?

2. Each speaker shall be entitled to an alternate address of thirty minutes, unless the other party waive his right.

3. The discussion to be moderated by three men, each of the parties choosing one, and these two a third, who shall be considered the president of the bench.

4. The discussion shall (God willing) commence on the 13th instant, at half past nine o'clock A. M. and continue, if necessary, until noon. It shall, if necessary, be resumed at four o'clock, and continue until half past six P. M. and continue from day to day *until both* parties shall be satisfied.

5. The debate shall be opened and closed by one party in the forenoon and another in the afternoon, and in case of a continuance, the party who relinquishes this privilege in the morning of the first day, shall, if requiring it, enjoy it on the morning of the second; and so on.

6. The conference to be held at the Universalist Church in Lombard street, and adjourned if necessary by mutual consent to some other suitable place."

W. L. M'CALLA,
ABNER KNEELAND."

Without taking time to dwell upon the features of Mr. Morse's grammatical preceptor as reflected in the composition of the above preamble, it may be safely observed that a man, who has, without authority, written over my name, a declaration which is no less untrue than ungrammatical, is capable of writing challenges in my name to Mr. Ballou of Boston, to Mr. Mitchell of New York, to Mr. Kneeland of Philadelphia, or to any Universalist bedlamite whose "good judgment" the "faithful brethren" may celebrate.

W. L. M'CALLA.

No. 17.

FROM THE FRANKLIN GAZETTE, OF SEPT. 11TH.

TO W. L. M'CALLA.

In yesterday's paper I observed three columns therein occupied with your signature placed at the bottom. In that communication, you appear to be wrangling, with your accustomed

expertness, with at least five different individuals, some of whom you have never yet seen! Permit me to ask you, sir, what all this is for? Is it because you had proved all or any of them to be dishonest or unchristian in any thing whichthey, or any one of them, have said or done? Or is the whole of that rancorous spirit which your communication breathes throughout against those individuals to be attributed to your hatred of universalism, united with your inordinate love of the doctrine of never-ceasing damnation, not for yourself, but perhaps for your "father, brother or wife?" Is all the litigiousness with which your writing is graced to be accounted for from your fondness to believe that *that* God who created *all* will consign a *part* to a quenchless burning hell? Let me ask, in my turn, what shall *we* think of that man who can call Mr Ballou's acceptance of what he supposed at the time was a challenge from you "an uncalled for refusal to meet me," when Mr. Ballou in his remarks explicitly says: "But before this, (i. e.) before I join these Reverend divines in the doctrine of despair, I promise to use my feeble powers to the utmost in defence of the Gospel?" The refusal of Mr. Ballou to meet Mr. M'Calla is not unlike what has more than once been called a refusal of the church in Lombard-street to continue the debate, when Mr. M'Calla as well knew he could have had the house longer, as he and others knew, that the weapons used by him against his opponent were, before the close of the discussion, becoming *very few and feeble.* Again, let me ask, what shall *we* think of that man, who, making Mr. M'Calla his conservator, draws up a paper, and after stating therein, designing to express Mr. Kneeland's sentiments, "God was the author of sin;" said that Mr. Kneeland founded his sentiment of universal salvation on this notion," instead of saying, as he ought to have said, in order to be consistent with himself and his former statement, Mr. Kneeland has written in a pamphlet thus: "God is the author of sin, and therefore will not punish it?" Will Mr. Magoffin be able to get the names of ten respectable men attached to a paper, wherein it shall be stated, that he never used the last quoted sentence as coming from Mr. Kneeland, or as exactly expressive of what Universalists believe! Let it be remembered by the opposers of Universalism that "the way of the transgressor *is* hard," and that no sinner has a right to expect, that he shall go unpunished for his sins. Let Mr. Magoffin and the *eminent philologist* who wrote in yesterday's Gazette turn their thoughts *within*; view their *studied policy* in their recent proceedings in relation to Universalists, not forgetting the *beautiful* allusions which the last has made concerning Hudibras, the wooden horse of Troy, the Universalist bedlamite; or they may with equal propriety bear in mind the conduct of any Presbyterian bedlamite, who hereafter wishes to employ *Mr. M'Calla* as a champion.

WILLIAM MORSE.

Philadelphia, Sept. 10, 1824.

No. 18.

FROM THE FRANKLIN GAZETTE.

TO MR. ABNER KNEELAND.

SIR: In answer to your letter of the 8th instant, addressed to me on the subject of my note to Mr. Ballou, I would state, that I was *fully convinced* that Mr. M'Calla never, at any time in his life, wrote, indited, or addressed one line on any subject, to either Mr. Ballou of Boston, or Mr. Mitchell of New York, by the simple declaration of Mr. M'Calla himself. *His word* concerning any fact to which he would testify, is sufficient ground for confidence to all who have any intimate acquaintance with him. I have been acquainted with him for several years, and could certify, were it needful, that he is a minister in the Presbyterian church, in good and regular standing with his brethren, and highly esteemed for his honesty, eloquence, talents, and piety, by thousands in our ecclesiastical communion. His veracity, so far as I know, was never questioned by any before he commenced a correspondence with you; and since, none doubt it but a few who believe in the universal salvation of mankind. These SEEM *to me* to doubt the veracity of *God*, and to believe in the veracity of "the father of lies," who said, "ye shall not surely die;" so that it is no wonder if they should call Mr. M'Calla "a liar."

The evidence which *fully convinced* and still convinces me of his soundness of mind, is presented to me by my *ears*, when I hear him speak on any subject, for he talks like a man of good sense; and by my *eyes*, when I read any of his writings.

His debate with yourself CONVINCED ME that he is "a man of sound mind," and I think came near to convincing your judgment, sorely against your will, that he is a champion for what the greater part of the christian world calls orthodoxy, of extraordinary polemical abilities and prowess. If he did not conquer YOU, at least *you* will admit, that a man of *no mean powers of mind* could not put him to flight in a contest of four days. In short, by the same kind of *evidence* which convinces me that Mr. Kneeland is not insane, but has a sound understanding, and other mental faculties, which I deem nearly as much perverted as those of Milton's devil, I am now *convinced* that Mr. M'Calla, in native energy of mind, in soundness of judgment, clearness of apprehension, accuracy of reasoning, rectitude of conscience, benevolence of heart, and even in the knowledge of *Hebrew and Grecian literature*, is every way Mr. Kneeland's superior.

Mr. M'Calla's letters to yourself since the debate have not failed to convince thousands who have read them with delight, that you have no need to desire a controvertist of *sounder* intellect.

EZRA STILES ELY.

Philadelphia, September 11, 1824.

No. 19.

FROM THE FRANKLIN GAZETTE, OF SEPT. 15.

TO MR. EZRA STILES ELY.

SIR—If, in reply to your note of the 11th instant, I do not use all that mildness to which I am accustomed, and which it is always a pleasure to me to observe, unless prevented by a sense of justice to myself, you well know the example I follow, with which you cannot be displeased, since it comes from yourself.

In answer to my note, you say, "I was *fully convinced*, &c." This, sir, you informed the public before, the truth of which I did not call in question; it was therefore unnecessary to repeat it: the subject of my inquiry was the *evidence* by which you were so convinced, and which you had not given to the public. You now say, "*his* [Mr. M'Calla's] *word* is sufficient ground of confidence, &c." If, sir, the public had been informed that you had the "*word*" of Mr. M'Calla as your authority for the truth of what you stated, and which no one could positively know except Mr. M'Calla himself, I should never have troubled you on this subject. Or if Mr. M'Calla had been as prompt in discovering the letter published by Mr. Ballou, as you were in disavowing the false statements which it contained in relation to yourself and Dr. Wilson, the public would have been set right at once, which would have prevented any groundless suspicions. Mr. Ballou, however, had every reason to suppose the letter genuine, and therefore treated it as such; and I do not see how the public could be *fully convinced* to the contrary, until it was discovered by the man whose name it bears. I have now in my possession one of the letters in question, and am thereby fully convinced that no part is in the hand-writing of Mr. M'Calla.

It gives me pleasure also to find that Mr. M'Calla stands so high among the clergy as a man of "honesty, eloquence, talents and piety by thousands in our [Presbyterian] ecclesiastical communion;" for all this adds weight to the importance of the late discussion; and I still hope that nothing will occur to lessen him in your estimation; but that you will still consider him "a champion for what the greater part of the Christian world calls orthodoxy." That he has "*extraordinary* polemical abilities and prowess," I believe will not be doubted by any who heard, or who shall read the discussion.

But, sir, after all, notwithstanding this high opinion of your friend Mr. M'Calla, you have not had the hardihood to deny that he has made the incorrect statements with which he is charged; neither have you attempted to reconcile the making of those erroneous statements with the possession, at the same time, of a sound mind. He stated, during the discussion, that I had written and

published a Greek Grammar, which is totally incorrect; that he was denied the use of the church in Lombard-street any longer, which is equally untrue; which statement he has repeated several times since, though it has been as often contradicted; and he has given no evidence whatever of its truth. He has also stated since the discussion that I have refused to meet him again; that I sent him the first number of the minutes of the discussion, and requested him to point out the errors if there were any; with several other statements, which I could name if I were disposed to multiply them, not one of which is correct. And, after all, I am not disposed to "call Mr. M'Calla 'a liar,'" though you quoted those words, "a liar!" thereby insinuating that he had been so called by "a few who believe in the "universal salvation of mankind," among whom you undoubtedly meant to include me! Such insinuations, without proof, more than to say, "these SEEM *to me*, &c." I consider far beneath the dignity of either the *gentleman* or the *christian*. It is more charitable to impute such intemperate language as that which has been used by Mr. M'Calla, and his vindicator, to a disturbed imagination, or a disordered brain, than it is to say that it proceeds from a worse motive. To say that such language proceeds from a mind that is "sound," is only to acknowledge, in other words, that it comes from a heart "desperately wicked."

I challenge you, sir, to show the least evidence that Universalists "doubt the veracity of God!" And what evidence can you give why it should so "SEEM" *to you* other than the evil surmisings of your own heart? By what evidence does it "SEEM *to you* that Universalists "believe in the veracity of the father of lies, who said, 'ye shall not surely die?'" I know of no Universalist but what believes that Adam did die the very death threatened, and that too "in the day" of his transgression. But those who believe that God threatened all mankind with *eternal death*, and then saves some of them from it; what do they but "doubt the veracity of God," and "believe in the veracity of the serpent, who said to our mother Eve, who, no doubt, was one of the elect, and who now says to all the elect, "ye shall not surely die?" Unless all mankind die the death threatened as a consequence of sin, how can you vindicate the testimony of God, or prove that the testimony of the serpent was false?

If some of these remarks should be rather "highly seasoned," so as to make your "lips smack,"* how could you expect any thing better from "Milton's devil?"

As to my *inferiority*, in every thing that is either *learned*, good or amiable, to Mr. M'Calla, in the opinion of one who supposes my "understanding and other mental faculties" so much "perverted," as the writer of the letter which I am now answering, it

* See your notice in the public papers of Mr. Brownlee's work against the Quakers, previous to its publication.

gives me no uneasiness whatever; because, in the mind of the man with whom Mr. M'Calla stands so very *high*, I may be *inferior*, and yet not be very *low*.

I am glad that Mr. M'Calla's letters to me have been read by "thousands," with so much "delight." I hope they will also be willing to read the discussion.

ABNER KNEELAND.

Philadelphia, Sept. 13*th*, 1824.

No. 20.

There was in the Democratic Press of Sept. 10th, 13th and 15th, a contest between Mr. Jennings and an anonymous writer by the name of Justice, in which the latter convicted the former of corruption in his report of the debate. He also produced evidence, both internal and external, that the report was under the management of Mr. Kneeland. Mr. Jennings denied that the book was written at Mr. Kneeland's house, but confessed that it was sold there, because it was a more central situation than his own! He confessed that he knew not even the letters of the sacred languages, but denied that Mr. Kneeland, or any body else aided him in writing his critical notes on these languages, except his "theologian" at his "elbow, which by the bye, is a little family dog." These are his own words. In the same paper, and in the Franklin Gazette, there was a controversy between Mr. Magoffin and Mr. Morse, in which the former convicted the latter of falsehood in repeated instances. Mr. Morse hints very strong suspicions that his antagonist obtained assistance from me in writing. This report which is utterly destitute of truth, he appears to have invented as an excuse for obtaining such assistance himself. His first and second pieces against Mr. Magoffin could not have been written by the same hand, and we shall soon see that the same remark is applicable to his first and second pieces against me in Nos. 17 and 24.

No. 21.

FROM THE DEMOCRATIC PRESS, OF SEPT. 22D.

DEBATE ON UNIVERSALISM.

Just published and now for sale, in four numbers, at 25 cents each, "Minutes of a Discussion of the Universalist Question, between Mr. Abner Kneeland and Dr. E. S. Ely, conducted in the Universalist Synagogue in Lombard-street, Philadelphia, July 13 to 17, 1824. Taken in short-hand, by R. L. Longhand."

This debate originated in the following challenge of Mr. Kneeland to Dr. Ely, as published in the Franklin Gazette of the 15th inst.* viz: "I challenge you, Sir, to shew, the least evidence that Universalists *doubt the veracity of God*." &c.

As it is probable that Dr. Ely, like a petulant friend of his, will say that this is a spurious report, seeing that the debate has never yet taken place, I would ask that gentleman what advantage there is in waiting? Does he expect that I could give the public a more faithful transcript of his language, sentiments and method after hearing him than before? A little experience would teach him better. One fact is better than a thousand theories; and it is a fact that cousin R. L. Short-hand was lately present at a debate, and he has ascribed to one of the parties, if my information be correct, language which he never uttered, and sentiments which he never believed. All that can be asked of a Reporter is that he shall do justice to the argument; and this can be done as well before the debate as afterward.

My opportunities of doing justice to Mr. Kneeland's argument are peculiarly happy, since every word in this report of mine is copied from a book lately published by my cousin R. L Jennings, now a *Universalist* Preacher. This book Mr. Kneeland says is "as faithful a report as ever was made," and will therefore enable me to shew his strength to great advantage.

The whole work is hereby "submitted to the respective parties and the moderators for their inspection." They are hereby requested to note any errors that they may observe "affecting the argument on either side." "Should no errors be pointed out by [them] notwithstanding this request, it will be considered an acknowledgment of the correctness of the work, and it will be recommended to the public accordingly."

As I, in company with my cousin, R. L. Jennings, would be glad of "a more central situation than my own to dispose of the work," he would oblige me by permitting his brother "who stays at Mr. Kneeland's through the day," for the sale of his books, to sell mine also. Mr. Kneeland also would confer a favour by taking my books through the streets under his arm, along with cousin R. L. Short-hand's productions. By this, however, I would not have the public to understand that Mr. Kneeland has any thing to do in my publication. I solemnly declare upon the veracity of a Universalist Preacher, that I have no connexion with that gentleman; no, not even so far as to have cousin R. L. Jennings' "little family dog" "at my elbow."

Without detaining the reader farther than to observe that the purchase of one number is an engagement for the whole work, I proceed now to the discussion.

No. 1.

Tuesday, Forenoon—Dr. Ely opened by clearing away the rubbish.

---

* See No. 19.

Mr. Kneeland. He has his mind marked out in a particular track; for, having anticipated, as he supposed, the ground which would be occupied by his opponent, he had his matter ready cut and dried to meet him. Has he referred to a single passage in the scripture to support his side of the argument?

Afternoon.—Dr. Ely enters upon his proofs.

Mr. Kneeland. He seems indeed to avoid the proposition altogether. I had expected he would have brought forth his strongest arguments in support of his side of the question, but am sorry to find he has not produced a single one relative to the point in discussion.

No. 2.

Wednesday, Forenoon.—Dr. Ely advances in the argument.

Mr. Kneeland. Let him come to the question, and the moment he can prove his proposition true, that moment I give up the contest, and must submit. But as he has brought forward nothing for me to answer; nothing in support of his argument; I have nothing to refute. I do not know even how to consume my thirty minutes! [*Laugh.*] My opponent has charged me with challenging the world to a public discussion. This I positively deny.

Afternoon.—More proofs from Dr. Ely.

Mr. Kneeland. I ask what did we come here to do? Why collect this crowded and respectable audience together? Was it not to discuss the proposition read in your hearing? I have therefore urged him on his own account, and for the sake of this enquiring assembly, if he be able to handle his doctrine as he ought, that he do it at once; for as yet, he has not said one word about it. It is useless for him to take up your time, and to disappoint your expectations by talking about my opinions and the supposed inconsistencies of my writings; *for they have no bearing upon the point whatever!* It appears to me, and I think it must also appear to you, that my opponent had not only the outlines, but the very body of his argument prepared before he came to the controversy; for he is going straight on in his long story without taking notice of aught I say.

No. 3.

Thursday, Forenoon.—Dr. Ely goes straight on.

Mr. Kneeland. I feel anxious to consume my thirty minutes, but in truth; I know not what to say. I have so repeatedly called upon my opponent to come forward with his evidence, that I think there will be no necessity to call upon him again, if he has any to produce. He has certainly not produced any yet that I observed, and I pay all the attention to my opponent's arguments that they deserve, as I take minutes of every thing of importance which he advances connected with the subject, and yet I have observed nothing. It has been suggested to me this morning, as a report in circulation, and very generally received; that an im-

pression was made upon the audience assembled here yesterday afternoon, very much in favour of my opponent, and that his cause was rising. If it be so I am truly glad of it! There is no person present to whom such a report affords more satisfaction than to your speaker; for, to it, in a great measure, may be attributed your being drawn together this morning in increased numbers. I am also glad that his cause is rising in your minds, because the more powerful impression he now makes on you, respecting the truth of his doctrine, the greater will be his defeat if he should fail to prove it. I am sorry that truth constrains me to declare, I have met with more powerful evidence, brought in favour of eternal misery, by lay-men, even by apprentice boys, at the Commissioner's Hall in the Northern Liberties, than I have heard this morning from my opponent. I feel sorry that a reverend gentleman should have come all the way from ——— to teach the citizens of Philadelphia theology, without being possessed of abilities better adapted to the task.

Afternoon.—The Doctor's evidence increases in strength.

Mr. Kneeland. Has he proved his part of the proposition? Has he met me on the point which was to decide it? No. he has not. And is it because he has evaded it, and has tried to lead you away from it, that his cause is rising? Does his cause yet rise? Does it yet make the shining faces as I understand so many of his friends had this morning? [*After a short lucid interval-Mr. Kneeland observed*] My hearers must perceive the reason why I go into this extraneous matter.—What shall I do?—Say nothing? If my opponent will give me any thing better to talk about, I will not wander.

No. 4.

Friday, Forenoon. Dr. Fly still strengthens his proofs.

Mr. Kneeland. As my opponent has given me nothing new to reply to, I have nothing of course to say in answer. Is the cause of my opponent still rising. Has he gained such a wonderful victory? The nearer a man approaches to the brink of a steep precipice the greater is the danger of his falling over. Has it not been so with my opponent? He would have drawn back, but I was too close behind him.

Afternoon. Mr. *Kneeland*. While I am speaking he is reading his little book, without attending to the arguments I may offer against his doctrine. My opponent has once more turned to his little book, and of this I am glad, for he has really entertained you better with what he has read therefrom, than he did in his former address. This is no discussion—this is continued reading straight forward on his part, and incessant entreaties on mine, to bring him to the point in dispute.

Dr. Ely being informed by Mr. Kneeland that the house might not be had any longer, closed.

Hearing that cousin R. L. Jennings had found dull sale for his work in 6 numbers, I thought it safer to divide mine into 4. If, however, it should meet with due encouragement, it is my intention to add two more numbers to the second edition. The 5th to contain cousin Jenning's first great effort after his ordination to the ministry in the Universalist Synagogue. It is his essay on *little family dogs*, published in the Democratic Press of the 13th inst.* It is said that Homer wrote *first* the wars of the frogs and then the war of Troy. There is no telling what our cousin may yet come to. He has already made such proficiency in the dead languages, that he thinks himself able "to compare the letters which are used to form one word with the letters that are used to form another, and if they do not agree, to alter them." At least, he thinks, "it is probable the writer, [that is, Cousin Jennings,] could do this much himself, were he to attempt it!" This is as much as to say that he has not yet attempted it. What then must we think of that genius who can consult Hebrew and Greek Lexicons and Concordances, and write critical notes on the sacred languages, when he has never yet *attempted* to learn their alphabets, and when he has no other created assistance than a *little family dog at his elbow.* If he had a great butcher's dog or a pack of hounds there, he would be equal to a man of *sound mind*, who said a few years ago, that he could speak all the languages spoken in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost.

The 6th number will be devoted to a couple of lectures written by brother Morse on the philosophy of language. In the first of them he will prove that when a preacher professes to write *on* Universalism, a lawyer *on* Forgery, or a physician *on* Insanity, they must write in favour of these things, or be guilty of deception.† To this will be appended a few remarks of brother Kneeland's last letter to Dr. Ely,‡ shewing that it is more charitable to attribute the use of such language "to a disturbed imagination or a disordered brain, than it is to say that it proceeds from a worse motive!" The second lecture will be on the subject of controversial etiquette; in which brother Morse will prove, according to the doctrine of his letter of the 10th inst.§ that for an orthodox minister to route five Universalist assailants at once, is as indecorous as the conduct of that revolutionary American who surrounded seven British soldiers.

Before taking leave of the public, I wish them to remember that the above report of Mr. Kneeland's defence of Universalism is in his own words, as approved by himself, without either alteration in language or injustice to argument. There is only a little liberty taken in an arbitrary arrangement of his expressions; in which however, I have been very modest, in comparison

*See No. 20. † See No. 16. ‡See No. 19. §See No. 17.

with my cousin R. L. Short-hand, in the liberties which he has taken, in suppressing and inventing, culling and collecting, altering and arranging the expressions of Mr. Kneeland's antagonist.

R. L. LONGHAND.

Philadelphia, Sept. 17, 1824.

No. 22.

FROM THE FRANKLIN GAZETTE, OF OCT. 7.

DEBATE ON UNIVERSALISM.

TO MR. WILLIAM MORSE.

In the Franklin Gazette of the 11th of September, you have addressed a letter to me. It is not necessary for me to state my reasons for answering it so tardily, or for answering it at all. Although it may be dishonourable for the five persons of whom you speak, to make an unfair and unjust assault upon me, there is no reason to be ashamed that God has enabled me to make a successful resistance. "There is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few." The case would not be altered if you and your four brethren were multiplied by a hundred, each brandishing a forged letter in his hand; For Jehovah has promised his faithful servants, that one shall "chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight." Whenever five men or five hundred resort to personalities and pious frauds, men of sense will suspect that their cause is desperate. Mr. Kneeland consumed much of his tedious time during the debate in canvassing my personal character, and you and Mr. Ballou have since joined him in that important occupation in the public prints, If this were not intended to injure the truth, you might divide my reputation, as the Jews did my Master's garments, between you. It is with the greatest reluctance that I leave, for a moment, the real subject in controversy, to answer forgeries and fables, whether the old-wives who publish them be *male* or female, *five* or fifty.

Although you and your associates, in subserviency to the great accuser of the brethren, are engaged in the same work, you have different lists of charges. The sum of your several catalogues appears to be, that you accuse me of saying, during the debate, that Mr. Kneeland wrote and published a Greek grammar;—of saying, since the debate, that I was denied the continued use of the house;—that Mr. Kneeland has since refused to meet me;—that Mr. Ballou has, without my invitation, done the same;—that Mr. Kneeland sent me the first number of Mr. Jennings's report;—that he has a hand with him in that work;—and that it is a spurious production.

As the affair of the Greek grammar is mentioned in the re-

port, an examination of *its* genuineness will, if Providence permit, recall that subject on a future occasion. The refusal of the house until my argument was completed may now receive a partial attention. Mr. Kneeland has said in an article of the 1st of September, and afterwards in his letter to Dr. Ely of the 13th, that it is *untrue* that I "was denied the use of the church in Lombard-street any longer." In the former, he says that "Dr. Ely knows himself to the contrary;" and in the latter, that Dr. Ely has "not the hardihood to deny" this and similar accusations. Besides the notorious concurrence of the audience who attended the debate, in denying this charge, it is well known to you that Dr. Ely had denied it in that very letter which this of Mr. Kneeland professes to answer. As Dr. Ely was our moderator on the last day, he must have known whether I was denied the farther use of the house or not. If I was not refused this privilege, he must have known that my complaint of the house being denied was untrue, and that to acquit me of falsehood was becoming an accomplice in my crime. Yet in his letter to Mr. Kneeland, of the 11th ultimo, he has not only acquitted me himself, but has declared that he believes my veracity to be unquestioned, not only among the hearers of our debate, but all others except a few Universalists. The following are his own words:

"His veracity, so far as I know, was never questioned by any before he commenced a correspondence with you; and since, none doubt it but a few who believe in the universal salvation of mankind. These SEEM *to me* to doubt the veracity of God, and to believe in the veracity of the 'father of lies,' who said 'ye shall not surely die;' so that it is no wonder if they should call Mr. M'Calla *a liar*."

This declaration of Dr. Ely is a denial of Mr. Kneeland's charge, and certainly attaches guilt to his subsequent assertion, that Dr. Ely had "not the hardihood to deny" a thing so notoriously incorrect.

In your letter you appear to think with some reason, that this subject may be illustrated by the case of Mr. Ballou, and the forged challenge which gave him such unnecessary alarm. Your words are, "the refusal of Mr. Ballou to meet Mr. M'Calla is not unlike what has more than once been called a refusal of the church in Lombard-street to continue the debate."

I confess they are alike in four particulars at least. 1. They are both well known matters of fact. 2. The same *moral infirmity* made Mr Ballou refuse to commence a discussion, which made Mr. Kneeland refuse to continue it. 3. Both these facts have been alike denied by Mr. Morse. 4. They resemble each other in both being made occasions of a charge of untruth against an innocent person, which charge recoiled upon its guilty

fabricator. They are therefore almost as much alike as two peas, or as the two pillars of Haman's gallows, which hung the man who built them.

While noting resemblances, you might with safety have added to the list Mr. Kneeland's refusal to meet me again, since the debate was closed. The assertion of this fact he has impugned in his letter of the 13th ultimo. In his communication of the 3d of September to Mr. Binns, he says, "it will be perceived that I have offered to meet Mr. M'Calla again, or in other words have accepted his challenge, on condition that his friends will open one of their churches to accommodate the audience, as proof that they approve of his manner of conducting an argument, *together with some other conditions therein named*, not ONE of which has he complied with. Until therefore he shall comply with those conditions, *or others equally fair*, I have nothing more to say to him on the subject."

It is said that he has impressed some of his credulous followers with a belief, that a compliance ON my part with ONE of his conditions such as finding a church, is all that he requires, to another meeting. In the above article, however, he refers to his letter of August 2d, published in the Franklin Gazette of Aug. 21st, and requires a compliance "with some other conditions therein named," such as uniting with him in religious worship and giving him my hand "in token of *friendship!*" that is, of *christian fellowship*, as he means. These conditions evidently require me to do what the church of Christ has never yet done; that is, to acknowledge the christianity of an Unitarian. They require me to violate a good conscience, and give up the point in dispute, before he will discuss it with me. What he means by other conditions "*equally fair*," I know not, unless he intends to require that in place of worshipping with him, his antagonist must be gagged, and that instead of giving him one hand, I must have both tied behind my back; for these conditions would be *equally fair* with those required in his letter. If I were to require as an indispensable condition to another meeting, that he should appear on the *arena* with a halter round his neck, every one would consider it a retreat from the conflict: so when he makes a *sine qua non* of a moral impossibility, it is a refusal to meet me. No man who was willing to submit his opinions to an investigation of this sort ever required such terms. Mr. Kneeland himself did not demand them until sore experience taught him to do so. His doing so, however, proves that while he boasts of success, he feels the realities of a defeat. His church was built for the spread of Universalism. He pretends that our debate promoted this end: yet the house cannot be obtained for me to finish my argument! He pretends that the discussion multiplied proselytes to Universalism, and greatly increased the sale of his books: yet we cannot have the house a

few days longer, least his books and his followers should multiply like the lice and the locusts of Egypt! A man whose conscience will permit him to speak and act so inconsistently, is not likely to be scrupulous about writing a false report, and afterwards denying it.

In Mr. Kneeland's article and letter of September 1st and 13th he charges me with saying that *he sent* me the first number of this report. I knew that Mr. Jennings had sent me the number; although I believed then, and believe now, that it was done with Mr. Kneeland's knowledge, and by his authority. I therefore stated in my letter to Mr. Norvell of August 10, ' that *a copy had been sent* to each of the parties." This was accompanied with an intimation of the quarter from which it came, as in the following extract: "The first number of Mr. Kneeland's promised minutes of the discussion, *professing to be taken in short hand by one of his friends*, has made its appearance. If there were no danger of detection, it would be a tolerably good book for promoting the views of its author. He has informed the public that a copy *has been sent* to each of the parties." This is not saying that Mr. Kneeland sent the book, but "that a copy has been sent." The person who sent it is "its author. He has informed the public" of the fact. It has two authors; Mr. Kneeland, who promised the minutes, and Mr. Jennings, who professed to take them in short hand. I meant, and I said with sufficient clearness, or at least with sufficient correctness, that the latter had sent me the first number. Mr. Kneeland insists upon it that I represented him as sending it.

He has perverted Dr. Ely's language in a similar way, though in a much more inexcusable manner. In his letter to him, he speaks as follows: "And after all, I am not disposed to call Mr. M'Calla a liar, though you quoted those words, ' a liar !" thereby insinuating that he had been so called by a few who believe in the universal salvation of mankind, *among whom you* UNDOUBTEDLY *meant to include* ME." Dr. Ely said and meant that a few Universalists had given me this name, because he had been circumstantially informed of the fact, as it occurred in the Lombard street church, a few minutes after the debate had closed. But he neither meant nor said that Mr. Kneeland was one of these persons, as appears by his verbal declaration, and by his letter. But, like the man who thought that every body he saw laughing was deriding *him*, Mr. Kneeland says, "you *undoubtedly* meant to include *me*." I suppose that we cannot hereafter speak of the world, the flesh and the devil, without *undoubtedly meaning to include* Mr. Kneeland, Mr. Jennings and his "little family dog;" which famous little animal has, according to Mr. Jennings's own account, become his preceptor in theology and criticism.* I could not give you a better piece of advice

* See No. 20

than to guard you against both the teacher and his evil-doing disciple, in the words of Paul to the Phillippians: "Beware of dogs, beware of evil-workers."

Although Mr. Jennings is the only one who has openly acknowledged his obligation to this Univeralist professor of theology, he is not the only *cynical* writer who defends his system. Perhaps you are acquainted with a certain moderator, who after a wholesome chastisement from the Rev. J. M. imitated Mr. Ballou, by snarling an insinuation against the intellectual soundness of his castigator. Excuse me for giving an extract from Mr. Kneeland's last letter to Dr. Ely in illustration of the same point. By way of administering a mild and charitable Universalist reproof to the doctor, for an insinuation which originated in Mr. Kneeland's own guilty suspicion, he tells him that he considers such insinuations "far beneath the dignity of either the *gentleman* or the *christian*. It is more charitable," continues this temperate and polished character; "It is more charitable to impute such intemperate language, as that which has been used by Mr. M'Calla *and his vindicator*, to a *disturbed imagination*, or a *disordered brain*, than it is to say that it proceeds from a worse motive. To say that such language proceeds from a mind that is *sound*, is only to acknowledge, in other words, that it comes from a heart *desperately wicked*."

The longer our correspondence continues, the clearer insight we obtain into the means by which Universalists defend their creed. They first charge their opponent with *undoubtedly meaning* some trifle which he never *meant* nor *said*. A solemn court of inquiry is then convened, composed of the wisest heads that can be found, on Mr. Kneeland's shoulders, and at Mr. Jennings's *elbow*. In such a court, the accused and his vindicator too, are immediately found guilty of *ungentlemanly* and *unchristian* conduct, proceeding from *a heart desperately wicked*. Then sweet charity begins to agitate their tender bosoms, and they set their heads and elbows closer together, to devise some pious fraud, some plan of mercy, whereby these *desperately wicked*, *ungentlemanly* and *unchristian* characters may be *lovingly* transmitted from the jail to the hospital. Like certain judges of old who handed over their orthodox victims to the secular arm, with earnest entreaties to spare their precious lives, these bland judges of ours, charitably wish that we could only be immured for life, and considered by the community as unfit for society! If this were the doom of Mr. J. M. and Dr. E. and all their vindicators, and the vindicators of truth, then each of their churches might be furnished with a Universalist pastor who is *compos mentis*; a qualification which is exceedingly important to the ministerial office, and which is to be found no where else than with Messrs. Ballou and Kneeland, Mr. Morse, Mr. Jennings, and his canine instructor.

These five accomplished specimens of sanity, charity, and Universalism, have not disappointed my expectations in any artifice which they have used to pollute my reputation. Before the commencement of the present controversy, my friends fairly warned me of the consequences, in the tenor of the old proverb, with which, no doubt, Mr. Jennings's experience coincides. "he that lies down with dogs must rise up with fleas." Yet, through grace, I am willing to bear all for the sake of that good cause, which, through the power of God, is moving forward, although, I may say with my *Divine* Redeemer, that "dogs have compassed me: the assembly of the wicked have enclosed me." However great may be their numbers and their industry, and however cunning they wish to be in their unprincipled malignity, it is evident that their counsels, like those of Absalom, are left to judicial infatuation. What more visionary scheme could a Universalist himself invent, than that of Mr. Jennings, to make the world believe that without any human aid, he could record from the lips of rapid speakers, with orthographical and even orthoepical accuracy, long dissertations on Hebrew and Greek words, when he does not pretend to an acquaintance with even the alphabets of these languages? He has made critical annotations to my pretended speeches. These, like Mr. Kneeland's writings, are an affectation of great familiarity with Hebrew and Greek literature. Is this consistent with the fact, that he does not know the names nor the powers of the letters composing those words which he pretends to have written? Without this knowledge himself, and without the aid of any other human being, this Universalist wiseacre would have the world believe that he can unlock the treasures of lexicons, and concordances, and translations in the dead languages! He must surely think not only that the parties are insane, but that the whole community is run mad. Such a tale carries in itself its own refutation. The man who can invent and utter such a story must have an understanding as beclouded as his conscience is depraved.

Yet, strange as it may seem. Mr. Kneeland, in the present sinking state of his affairs, has caught at this straw, to keep him from going to the bottom. He has even made repeated assaults upon the character of my head and heart, because I will not join him and his short-hand aid-de-camp in this mutiny against common sense. What makes this Universalist *conspiration* against sanity and integrity the more absurd, is that Mr. Kneeland's participation in Mr. Jennings's celebrated minutes of the debate is proved by frequent newspaper publications of his own. While I proceed to show this, will you be so kind as to remember that your Mr. Jennings has said in the Franklin Gazette, of August 2, "I therefore publickly acknowledge myself to be the *sole* publisher of the said debate, and as publicly *disown* being

engaged with *either* of the parties, *directly* or *indirectly.*" Compare this with Mr. Kneeland's previous declaration, published July 21, that "the whole discussion has been taken down in short-hand by a stenographer *employed* for the purpose.'' Who it is that has *employed* this *unengaged* reporter must be learned from the Universalists, one of whom, not being aware of the cheat, declared to several persons, of whom I was one, that the vestry of his church, of whose integrity he appeared to have a high opinion, intended to appropriate the surplus proceeds of the work to some charitable purpose. This he said by way of recommending the book to our patronage. Knowing that Mr. Kneeland was the soul of that Vestry, and knowing that 'the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel,' the plan did not meet my approbation.

Whether Mr. Jennings is or is not "engaged with either of the parties, directly or indirectly," will appear farther from Mr. Kneeland's "caution to the public" against the catch-penny pamphlet, called the *Substance of the debate.* In this notice, published in the National Gazette, July 23d, he pledges his word that the public shall be furnished with "the real discussion in full." His words are the following: "A copy-right of the real discussion has been secured, and will soon be published in full." In this instance he makes no allusion to Mr. Jennings, and in the former he does not mention his name, but only speaks of him as "a stenographer employed for the purpose." In both cases he makes the promise on his own responsibility: Why could he not make the same engagements with regard to the pamphlet which he had just condemned as a catch-penny? Evidently because he had nothing to do with that work; whereas Mr. Jennings's catch-penny was subject to his control. This is the only reason which a reasonable man can give for promising, on his own responsibility, that it shall be *the real discussion in full.*

In Mr. Jennings's article of August 7, he says: "I am the reporter of neither Mr. Kneeland nor Mr. M'Calla." Compare this with Mr. Kneeland's letter of August 2. The following are his words: "As to the new matter to which I had not an opportunity to reply [Ps. 9: 5] since it makes nothing in your favor, nor against any of my arguments, a bare note in a very few lines will be all the reply I shall need." Although in the debate Mr. Kneeland refused me the liberty of finishing my argument, he gave me the last speech. He voluntarily resigned the privilege of replying then, and has ever since refused to open the discussion anew. Notwithstanding this, he has no doubt of an opportunity to reply now, and thus virtually have the last speech in Mr. Jennings's disinterested and impartial report!

As Mr. Kneeland had informed the public that a person was "*employed* for the purpose," it was expected that he would ob-

day or other condescend to let us know his name. Accordingly, in a notice of August 6th, he tells us that these minutes were "taken in short-hand by R. L. Jennings." Although this notice announced the work as now in press, and described its character, and detailed its terms of sale and place of deposit, it was not still Mr. Jennings's notice but Mr. Kneeland's. The former is not yet known as an independent editor, but the latter of this promising pair, who had first told us that a stenographer was employed, then promised to give us the "real discussion in full," now comes forward over the head of Mr. Jennings, and informs us of his terms of supplying purchasers, subscribers and agents; and closes by telling the public that the "books may be had *at the Rev. Mr. Kneeland's*, or at the bookstores generally in the city."

It is evident that the first plan adopted by these partners in iniquity was for Mr. Jennings to keep himself out of view, and to pass off their spurious minutes as an authentic report, approved by the moderators, but particularly authorized by both the parties; "knowing," as Mr. Jennings says, "that with their approbation the work would be better received by the public." For this purpose a general rumor was industriously propagated, that Mr. Kneeland and myself acted in concert. By means of an Universalist who really thought the story true, a near relative of my own was impressed with a belief of its correctness, until I undeceived him. As Mr. Kneland had already in his own opinion, gained one object by writing for both parties, without my consent, he tried what could be done by the same method in carrying this point also. For this purpose, when he published in the National Gazette his caution against the rival catch-penny, and promised to the public his own catch-penny, which he nicknamed "the real discussion," he added the following note: viz. "Printers who have advertised the above work will do an act of justice to *the parties* by inserting the above." The effect which Mr. Kneeland knew this would produce, and which it did produce very decidedly and extensively, was considerably increased and confirmed by my being precluded from the privilege of exposing the imposition in the same paper.

Although this artifice caught many a penny from persons who have since declared themselves grossly deceived, Mr. Kneeland found that it would finally fail. As the public must soon be convinced that the report was disavowed and condemned by me, he was determined to wash *his* hands of it, lest it should be treated as a Universalist book. The plan must be altered. The responsibility must now be devolved upon some *impartial* person. Under this character it is that Mr. Jennings makes his *entre* before the public as the *sole* editor of the work. A report is circulated that he is a Baptist; of course my friends must

buy his book. In the commencement of this new campaign, he blusters in the papers about not being able to find me in the city; insinuating that I retreat to the country for fear of meeting him. At last, after riding twelve miles for his accommodation, I obtained an interview with this new acquaintance, and asked him to what religious denomination he belonged. He at first insinuates that he is a Baptist. Upon a cross examination, he is obliged to confess himself a Universalist. As this occurred in the presence of witnesses, he considered farther dissimulation in this particular of no use, and therefore turned out Universalist preacher immediately after. Although this was done under the patronage of Mr. Kneeland, who had, with his implicit approbation, promised and proposed the report on his own responsibility, and represented Mr. Jennings as "employed for the purpose," the latter now declares himself "the *sole* publisher of the said debate," "the reporter of neither Mr. Kneeland nor Mr. M'Calla," and is daring enough to "disown being *engaged* with either of the parties, *directly or indirectly*."

Being thus embarked in a vessel which Mr. Kneeland had abandoned, the disciple hoists the same false colors under which the master had sailed. Notwithstanding my frequent public condemnations of his report, he persists, number after number, in an attempt to persuade the community that I have not found one fault in it, and of course that it appears to me correct. Take his postscript on the cover of the fourth number as a specimen: viz. "This fourth number is respectfully presented to the public; not with increased confidence of its correctness, but with increased satisfaction that the former numbers have been received with such *general approbation*, not one error having been pointed out, according to the above request, in any one of the three first numbers." The fifth number would, doubtless, have been adorned with a similar postscript, if Mr. Jennings had not known that it contained an invented address of one of the moderators; which goes clearly to prove that this man is essentially deficient either in skill or integrity as a reporter. With divine permission this shall be more fully proved in a short time.

While Mr. Kneeland was the ostensible editor, he advertised without hesitation that "the books may be had at the Rev. Mr. Kneeland's." Since he has become ashamed of his authorship, it is necessary to cloak his activity in selling the work. For this purpose Mr. Jennings, in his article of the 11th ultimo, tells us that the books were sold at Mr. Kneeland's house merely because it was a *more central situation* than his own, and that his brother, a lad, stayed there during the day, as a salesman! A very important point this, when the author had already told us that the bookstores generally were engaged in the sale. But if every bookseller were in Mr. Kneeland's situation, which how-

ever is not the case, Mr. Jennings's fruitful invention could easily furnish them with a lad apiece to bear the responsibility. How different is this complicated and contradictory system of Universalist chicanery from the plain dealing of orthodox honesty! As soon as possible, I hope to lay before the public my own book, with my own name to it. I wish no one else to write it or to father it for me.

October 5, 1824. W. L. M'CALLA.

No. 23.

FROM THE DEMOCRATIC PRESS, OF OCT. 7.

UNIVERSALISM AND UNITARIANISM.

Mr. Binns:—In the universal joy of Americans, occasioned by the visit of General La Fayette, the Clergy of all denominations have a cordial participation. In Philadelphia, they have made an open expression of a sentiment which is every where felt, though generally in silence. On Friday the 1st inst. they waited upon our illustrious visitant in a body. They consisted of Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, German Lutherans, and Swedish Lutherans. Besides Presbyterians of the General Assembly, there were members of the Scotch Reformed and Associate Churches, as also of the Dutch Reformed, German Reformed and several other denominations, amounting as I was told, to about seventy persons. However these differed in their views of doctrine and worship, government and discipline, they appeared to agree in these three things at least. 1. In placing Bishop White, the venerable Chaplain of the Revolutionary Congress, in the chair. 2. In loving our national guest, the companion of Washington, as an instrument in the hand of God, for the establishment of American Liberty. 3. In excluding from their procession those clergymen, (falsely so called,) who deny the supreme deity of Jesus Christ, and a future state of rewards and punishments. Those who are called Universalists here, deny these and other essential truths of Christianity. Neither they nor the Unitarians made their appearance, nor were they invited. In this, the orthodox clergy acted as their fathers did in the churches of England and Scotland, of France and Switzerland, Germany and Holland, Bohemia and Poland; as did the Hussites and Lollards, the Waldenses and Albigenses, the Claudians and Paulicians; like the churches and councils of Greece and Rome in their best days, which rejected such men as Arius and Sabellius; and like the Apostles, who rejected Cerinthus and Simon Magus.

By the 9th article and 4th section of the Constitution of this State, it will be seen that none but such a Universalist or Athe-

ist, as denies "a future state of rewards and punishments shall, on account of his religious sentiments, be disqualified to hold any office or place of trust or profit under this Commonwealth." God has declared that "he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

W. L. M'CALLA.

Philadelphia, Oct. 6th, 1824.

No. 24.

Although, upon a comparison of the following communication in the Democratic Press, of October 14th, with No. 17, and other productions of Mr. Morse, it will be found that he has got some man to lend his pen, who had too much sense and respectability to risque his name; yet as Mr. Morse is responsible for its contents, it shows him to be a decided Unitarian in doctrine and practice. In doctrine, because he denies the Trinity, and the existence of a Devil. In practice, because he denies what he knows to be true; that is, that those, who, like him and Mr. Kneeland, reject the doctrine of a future punishment, are disqualified by the constitution of the state, from holding offices of trust or profit.

For the Democratic Press.

ENDLESS MISERY AND TRINITARIANISM.

Mr. Binns.—In your paper of the 6th inst. a short communication made its appearance under the title of "Universalism and Unitarianism," which for childishness and arrogance exceeds, in my humble opinion, any thing before presented to the public from the pen of the self-constituted champion of reputed orthodoxy *whose signature it bears*. The purport of the whole appears to be simply to inform the world of the fact, that "*I, (W. L. M'Calla) have been in person* to see Gen. La Fayette; whilst some others, *less officious*, or less greedy after mushroom popularity than myself, have not availed themselves of the opportunity." Though the above be the apparent, yet it is not the sole object which Mr. M'Calla had in view in presenting the public with this important item of intelligence. He thought he had now too good an opportunity to let pass of irritating universalists and unitarians in a body, as well as attempting to prejudice the public mind against them. We have the satisfaction, however, to believe, that Mr. M'Calla stands entirely alone in this affair, and that no single one of the liberal minded clergy in this city, nay of the whole country, will thank him for his officiousness, at this particular time, in striving to mar the reputation of those whose only crime is that their religious faith does not exactly correspond with his own.

It is indeed truly strange that Mr. M'Calla, on an occasion which called forth the gratitude of every heart, and in the midst of that universal harmony which pervaded all classes, sects, and parties, could not have suppressed that spirit of maliciousness for which he has on some former occasions distinguished himself. The joy produced by the presence of the illustrious visitor, the friend of civil and religious liberty, was pure and unmingled, and *would have remained uninterrupted*, had it not been for the peevishness of a solitary individual. Mr. M'Calla *stated, that they all agreed* "in excluding from their procession those clergymen (falsely so called) who deny the supreme deity of Jesus Christ," &c. I would ask who excluded them? *Why the Clergy*. But did the authority of the city, or did General La Fayette himself exclude them? Surely not; for *universalists did visit him*, and he treated them with equal attention and respect, evincing thereby that nobleness of mind which has marked his steps in every transaction of his life.

Universalists and unitarians had the same privilege of forming a procession that others had, and perhaps would have made as respectable an appearance (but for their numbers) as the procession did, in whose ranks was numbered the *modest* Mr. M'Calla. The only sanction which Mr. M'Calla has given for the proceedings of which he has borne so conspicuous a part, is the conduct of those whose faith accords with presbyterians; but we have great reason to be thankful that in this land of freedom and independence, such contracted views do not form the standard by which to judge of a man's piety or merit. As to his classing universalists and atheists together, he has manifested either too much ignorance or too much wilfulness to render it worthy of comment. What he has extracted from the 9th article of the constitution of this state, he as well knows *does not disqualify universalists* from holding offices of trust or profit, as he does, that many of the civil officers, not only of this state, but of the United States, are universalists and unitarians. Before Mr. M'Calla boasts any more *of his having visited* the General, while some others did not, *which privilege (as he would insinuate) was denied them*, on account of believing the doctrine of universalism or unitarianism, I hope he will have the goodness to inform the public what qualified *the most distinguished citizens of Boston and Cambridge for the company of* Gen. La Fayette; or *what qualified the Hon. John Q. Adams* for the General's society while he tarried in this city! It will be easy for all to conclude who know the religious faith of the individuals to whom I have just alluded, that their qualifications did not consist in embracing the *doctrine of the Trinity*, of their believing in the *existence of the devil as a "fallen angel,"* nor of their belief of the interminable torments of the wicked.

Philad. Oct. 11, 1824. WILLIAM MORSE.

No. 25

DEBATE ON UNIVERSALISM.

FROM THE FRANKLIN GAZETTE, OF OCT. 21.

Mr. Norvell: As my report of the late theological discussion is now completed, and will be presented to the public in a few days, I beg leave to trouble you with the following remarks, in answer to some of Mr. M'Calla's statements in relation to me, which appeared in your Gazette of the 7th instant, presuming that if I can show that the *most prominent* of his assertions are not founded on fact, it would only be intrusion to attempt to prove that the remainder are equally unfounded and unjust. He insists, that *I* was employed by the Universalist church to report the discussion. This is not a fact. *Had he taken the pains to have inquired, he would have found that it was a Mr. Stetson who was engaged by the church, which engagement Mr. Stetson could not fulfil, in consequence of the discussion being protracted longer than he could remain in the city; or for some other cause to me unknown. I then, being the only person who had notes of the whole of the debate, considered it a duty I owed to the public to publish my report of it,* knowing that it could not be obtained from any other source. *Immediately after I had made known my intention,* Mr. M'Calla appeared in your Gazette, and stated that the work was "*unauthorized,*" because, I suppose published without his authority. I, in my reply of August 7, stated that I considered myself the reporter of neither Mr. Kneeland nor Mr. M'Calla, not having been engaged by either of them nor by any other individual in existence, but the reporter of the public, whom alone I considered my authority for publishing it. From the purest motives, I undertook and have completed the laborious task; namely, from a conscientious belief that it will be useful to the public. Had any other person possessed the materials for furnishing the report in full, as I have given it, I should have been glad to have been freed from so unthankful an office; for it is well known to those who are in the habit of reporting debates in congress, in the state legislatures, or in the houses of parliament in Great Britain, that speakers do not always repay with kindness the faithful labours of a reporter. Speakers are apt to forget many things they have stated; the more faithful, therefore, the reporter is in reporting expressions used by them in the warmth of debate, the less they thank him for his fidelity, when, in their cooler moments, those expressions meet their eyes, to which their heads, I will not say their hearts, have given birth. The case of Mr. M'Calla, then, is not singular. He is not the first who has denied his speeches, nor is it likely he will be the last. It is natural for a man of sanguine temperament, in the warmth of argument, to use expres-

sions which, on reflection, he would perhaps gladly expunge from the reporter's minutes; but which, in this instance, are given to the world as they were delivered. Had I been less faithful, it is probable I should have escaped the chastening pen of Mr. M'Calla; and, as the author of a little pamphlet which appeared immediately after the close of the debate, have passed along unheeded. But Mr. M'Calla, as soon as I made known my intention of publishing my report, being aware of the *powers of the stenographic art*, was determined to be beforehand with me; he therefore endeavoured to prejudice the public against my report by publicly denouncing it as "spurious" before he had seen a line of it! It is true, he has since attempted to *prove* that it is "partial, unsatisfactory and spurious;" but how? *Not as a candid man would, by pointing out, when requested, one or more of the real or supposed errors*, as a proof that he had something to ground his assertions on: No! but by telling the world that I am a Universalist! This, he thinks, is quite sufficient to justify him in any thing he may be pleased, in the plenitude of his charity, to alledge against me, no matter how seriously it may affect my interest or my character. This *proof* of my having given an unfaithful report may do very well, coming from Mr. M'Calla, for the bigotted, the illiterate, and the unthinking part of the community; but it will not convince a man of sober reflection; for he will see, immediately, that by pursuing this train of reasoning, it would be morally impossible to have a faithful report. This debate was not the affair of a select few, nor of a party, but one in which all are interested, whether Pagan, Mahometan, Jew or Christian; and between the two points of controversy their is no intermediate belief; for every individual in existence, if he think at all on the subject, believes that *there is* a future state of punishment in another world, or *there is not*. As I have thought and examined a great deal upon this subject, I must necessarily believe with one or other of the two disputants. Suppose then, I believed with Mr. M'Calla, that there is a future state of punishment in an immortal state; by the very same rule that he attempts to prove that a Universalist can not possibly give a faithful report, he equally proves the utter impossibility of a faithful report being given by one who is not a Universalist, or by any other individual in existence.

Mr. M'Calla's reasoning upon this subject, however, is consistent with the system of logic by which he can demonstrate to the satisfaction of any person, as narrow-minded as himself, that if a universalist were to give a loaf of bread to a poor famishing fellow creature to keep him from actual starvation, or to give him a blanket in the depth of winter to keep his slow circulating blood from freezing in his veins; or if he, as the Samaritan of old, were to administer to the wants of a distressed and wounded traveller; in any one of these cases, this Mr. M'Calla, with a

truly Levitical spirit, would prove it was a very *wicked, cruel* action! Now, sir, this is not a mere assertion of mine; it is what he, who styles himself a servant of God, a minister of the meek, the benevolent Jesus, has himself informed you. He stated in his communication of the 7th instant, that a Universalist told him, and several others who were present, that the surplus proceeds of my report were to be given for some *charitable purpose.* "This he, the Universalist, said by way of recommending the book to our patronage. *Knowing that the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel,* the plan did not meet *my approbation!*" This is the language of a "self-styled" minister of Christ: I have borrowed Mr. M'Calla's expression "self-styled," and now give you my authority for applying it to him. The scriptures declare that "If a man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Has the Spirit of Christ been manifested by this reverend gentleman, in his unprovoked and unfounded attempt to asperse my character as a reporter, without producing a solitary proof that he had any other ground for it than that I differed with him in point of faith; unless indeed it be, that as he is going to publish the discussion himself, he wishes my book out of the way, to make room for his own, reasoning as the Ambitious Alexander, that as the earth cannot bear two suns, neither can the christian world bear two books. This indeed may be the *sole* cause of all his spleen, but the man who could descend to such meanness to accomplish his purpose must have an understanding as beclouded as his conscience is depraved. But admitting all Mr. M'Calla has stated about "conspirations," "engaged reporters," and "deputy publishers," to be true, what will it amount to, if I can prove that my report is faithful, satisfactory and impartial? This I shall now do, and let the public decide between mere assertion and positive proof. In his communication of the 7th instant, he says, "It is evident that the first plan adopted by these *partners in iniquity* was for Mr. Jennings to keep himself out of view, and to pass off their *spurious minutes* as an *authentic report* approved by the moderators." Now to shew how regardless this man is of truth, and of my reputation, I have by particular request obtained from these *very moderators certificates of the correctness of my report,* which I here insert:

From the Rev. Dr. Ely.

At the request of Mr. Jennings, I would state, that I have not been able, since the publication of his "Minutes of a Discussion," &c. to read more than *fifty pages* of the work, which is less than one sixth part of the whole. So soon as I can find time to read the whole, I shall freely communicate, at his request, my opinion of the same. *He does not pretend, in every sentence, to give the words of the speakers, and therefore they cannot be considered as responsible for any thing contained in the Minutes, until they admit themselves to have spoken it,* or

else are proved to have uttered the same. For my part, I wish the Minutes may be attentively read, which will prepare inquirers for the subsequent perusal of Mr. M'Calla's expected publication on the controversy; and for the establishment of their own minds on this important question, whether there is any punishment for impenitent sinners after the present life, or not? During the debate of Tuesday afternoon, July 13th, I was absent; so that I can only express an opinion on the first *forty pages*, and the short speech attributed to myself, on pages 234 and 235, concerning which I am free to declare, that I discover in these forty-two pages, so for as my memory serves me, *no important error or omission. I uttered more than Mr. Jennings has recorded, and the other speakers may have done the same.* Had I attempted, after speaking, to give my own words, I do not know that I should have been literally and verbally accurate, any more than the stenographer. *I did not intend to convey the idea, nor can I say that Mr. Jennings has attributed it to me, that I would have no objection to hear Mr. Kneeland preach, under any circumstances,* which would imply, that I thought him a minister of the gospel, or of the true religion; *for I would not, after knowing his sentiments, receive him into my house in the character of a servant of Christ. As a man, I will show him any kindness in my power; but I conceive myself positively forbidden to countenance any one, in any manner, as a minister of the gospel, who brings an essentially different gospel from that contained in the bible.* After all, I think the forty-two pages, of which I now give my opinion, *as just a statement of what was uttered in my hearing, as could be expected of any stenographer,* who should attempt to follow men of ready utterance, in a debate of TWENTY HOURS.

EZRA STILES ELY.

Philadelphia, October 12, 1824.

It will be remembered that these forty pages, to the correctness of which the doctor has certified, contain the greater part of *those very three speeches and a fragment of a speech* attributed to W. L M'Calla, and which he in the Gazette in the most positive terms disowned! The speech of Dr. Ely, having nothing to do with the argument, *I did not attempt to give in full as delivered,* but have merely given an outline of it, and this I submitted to the doctor for his correction, before I sent it to the press; *the only alteration he made was substituting week-day for any day in the week:* yet this outline of his speech, corrected and approved by himself, Mr. M'Calla calls "an invented address," which I put into the mouth of one of the moderators! *Let him settle this point with Dr. Ely and his own conscience.* As to the correctness of the remainder of the report, I beg leave to present you with the following certifi-

cates, though I am fully aware they do not agree with the unfounded assertions of Mr. M'Calla, nor will they "go clearly to prove that this man is essentially deficient in skill, or in integrity as a reporter," as the truly christian spirited Mr. M'Calla basely insinuated in his last communication. The following have been selected from those received.—

From the reverend William Hogan, late pastor of St. Mary's Church, South Fourth-street, and the reverend William Morse, pastor of the Second Universalist Church, Callowhill-street.

To the public.

We, the subscribers, hereby certify, that we have examined the "Minutes" of the "Theological Discussion" between the reverend Abner Kneeland and the reverend William L. M'Calla, which were taken in short hand by Mr. R. L. Jennings, and, in our opinion, they contain a true and faithful report of that discussion, *without any omissions or additions affecting the arguments* of either of the disputants.

WILLIAM HOGAN,
WILLIAM MORSE,
Philadelphia, October 13, 1824. Moderators.

Certificate from the reverend Abner Kneeland, pastor of the first Independent Church of Christ, called Universalist, Lombard-street.

Having carefully examined the report of the late "Discussion" between the reverend William L. M'Calla and myself, as taken in short hand and published by Mr. Jennings, I hereby certify, that the arguments are essentially the same as delivered by us, in all their parts, together with the style and manner in which they were delivered: and although in many places I can perceive some verbal difference, yet, as far as my memory serves me, there is nothing *added or omitted which in any manner affects the arguments on either side.*

ABNER KNEELAND.

Philadelphia, October 16th, 1824.

Certificate from D. Francis Condie, M. D.

Mr. R. L. Jennings,

Dear sir—I received your request this morning, and in reply, beg leave to state, that I attended during the whole of the discussion between the reverend A. Kneeland and reverend W. L. M'Calla, on the subject of the punishment for sin, part of which I myself took down: I have perused with attention your "Minutes" of that discussion, as published; and have the pleasure of certifying to their correctness You have not only presented *every argument offered on both sides of the question,*

but, what is always a difficult task, have retained in the report the *peculiar style* of each party, and most generally their *very words*. I may further add, that those with whom I have conversed, in relation to the work, as well those who oppose as those who believe in the doctrine held by the Universalist Churches, have all borne testimony to its correctness.

Yours, D FRANCIS CONDIE.

South Fifth-street, October 13th, 1824.

The reverend Dr. Wylie, of the Presbyterian Church, Eleventh-street, has given me permission to certify to the following effect—

That from motives of curiosity rather than approbation, he attended at the church in Lombard-street, during the debate between the reverend Abner Kneeland and the reverend W. L. M'Calla, three times, in the whole about two hours and a half, and although he has seen in the public papers, that the report is not acknowledged by the Rev. Mr. M'Calla to be correct, yet *truth obliges him to declare*, that he can not discover the least difference, *even in expression*, between what is contained in the report and what he heard delivered by the speakers when at church.

More certificates of the correctness of the report have been received, but the above, it is presumed, will be considered fully satisfactory. R. L. JENNINGS.

I have trespassed, sir, largely upon your columns, and upon the patience of your readers, but it is with the hope that this is the last time that I shall trouble you on this subject, for Mr. M'Calla must convince me that the ears of those gentlemen, who have certified to the correctness of my report, though perhaps not so *long* as his own, are not capable of receiving sounds, and their memories not capable of retaining them, before I shall consider myself under any necessity of answering any more of his publications, having here given sufficient proof to satisfy any unprejudiced mind of the correctness of my report, and it is presumed that even Mr. M'Calla, wide as he ranges in the field of bare assertion, will not feel himself at liberty to state that the respectable members of his own church, or the others, whose integrity is equally unquestionable, are my partners in iniquity, nor that they have given their names to aid in "passing off spurious minutes as an authentic report." But if he should be disposed to say so, let his future communications be addressed to them, and not indirectly to

Yours respectfully, R. L. JENNINGS.

No. 26.

FROM THE FRANKLIN GAZETTE, OF OCT. 23.

DEBATE ON UNIVERSALISM.

Although there was no reason, from the beginning, to hope that such a character as Mr. Jennings would make a fair report of my argument as far as it went, my apprehensions on this subject were not, to the best of my recollection, publicly expressed until after his first number made its appearance: yet he has repeatedly published that Mr. M'Calla "denounced the report *altogether*," "before he saw it," "before he saw a line of it." This is the burthen of his song in yesterday's Gazette. Mr. Kneeland also has published that I denounced the report as *altogether spurious*. Some of their followers have taken this for granted, and used it with that industry which might be expected. Mr. Kneeland and Mr. Jennings refer, I suppose, to a communication for the Franklin Gazette of August 5, a few days before the appearance of the first number. In this I said that I was, "contrary to a written agreement, compelled to a premature close, and afterwards denied an opportunity of finishing." For this reason, his intended, and as yet unseen work, is called a *spurious production*. This is done in a note with express reference to what had gone before. Although Mr. Jennings has said that I denounced it *altogether*, and Mr. Kneeland as *altogether spurious*, this is wholly without foundation. The word *altogether* was added by themselves, contrary to my plain meaning. It has been already shown that Mr. Kneeland wrote something much more serious than this over my name, without my knowledge or permission. I hope soon to show that Mr. Jennings is his promising disciple. If either of these persons were to issue proposals for publishing a *complete* New Testament, while yet they intended to omit what they call the disputed books, and many chapters and verses of other books, I should, after such information, pronounce it a spurious production, without waiting to see it. I would not call it *altogether* spurious, because I could not tell whether it might not be genuine as far as it went. But these Universalist preachers would think it quite justifiable to alter my expressions until they would answer their purpose. They intended to publish for my whole argument what I knew, and what they knew, to be only a part. This would injure its integrity as much as if they were to corrupt it by interpolations. I therefore pronounced it spurious, and gave this as a reason. This was correct in language, and true in fact. The community understood my meaning, and so did those who perverted my words.

Mr. Kneeland pretends that Mr Jennings is the sole publisher of these Minutes, without being in the least under his control. Suppose that I *had* denounced it as *altogether spurious*, without

seeing it. Would not this be as justifiable as for him to pronounce it *altogether genuine* without seeing it? And yet this he did in the National Gazette of July 23, by promising, on his own responsibility, before he read the work, that the public should be furnished with *the real discussion in full.* A *faux pas* of this description, in an orthodox minister, is of such importance that he must be declared guilty even when innocent; but in Mr. Kneeland it is a matter of as little consequence as a speck of dirt on a climbing-boy. Some of those who have been most clamorous against me, for a supposed premature condemnation of a work really corrupt, see no fault in my opponent for a premature and unqualified approbation of the same work.

The plan upon which this report was conducted is perhaps as exceptionable as the execution. The author has insinuated that there was some prospect of his becoming a reporter to congress. Would they be satisfied if he would give nothing but their argument? Would Randolph, Clay and Webster wish their thoughts clothed in the language of Mr. R. L. Jennings? Yet he would persuade us that this is his privilege as a reporter. On the cover of No. 1, he requests us to note only errors "affecting the argument." On the cover of No. 3, he acknowledges that he had omitted certain ridiculous words of Mr. Kneeland, of which a hearer of the debate reminded him; yet he says, "I consider myself only bound to acknowledge errors which may be pointed out, *affecting the argument*, on either side." On this plan, a stenographer once reported a four hours' speech of an eminent minister in this city, in such a compass as could be read in fifteen minutes. What he did not understand he left out; and what he thought he understood, he recorded in a manner so shamefully distorted that the speaker submitted to the mortifying drudgery of correcting the manuscript to keep him from publishing things in his name which would be a reproach to religion.

If the reporter be allowed to give his judgment of the argument instead of the words of the Speaker, it is evident that the character of the speech must be formed, not by the sentiments of its author, nor by his ability in defending them, but by the reporter's knowledge of language, skill in reasoning, and talents and experience in composition. A man of ingenuity could clothe a poor argument with a plausible dress, and *vice versa.* As Mr. Jennings is now one of Mr. Kneeland's preachers, he probably thinks himself eminently qualified in this respect. He may even suppose that I owe him as polite a bow as Pope gave to Warburton for expressing his meaning better than he could do it himself. Mr. Kneeland may perhaps give it as a fourth evidence of an unsound mind, that I, with such moderate claims, prefer my own speeches to a set of Universalist harangues manufactured for me by a student of his.

Upon this plan of running one man's defence in the mould of another, it is evident that its character must be, in a great measure, formed by the reporter's creed, as well as his talents. This made Mr. Kneeland pervert many of my arguments, and misstate many of my declarations during the debate. It has made him often insinuate, and even expressly assert, that my defence had no argument at all. In his letter of August 2, he tells me that I had misspent *four days*, and "probably might continue a month in the same way, and, after all, to no purpose." It is, I believe, the general opinion of men of piety and good sense, that a strong and unanswerable argument may be drawn from the case of the rich man and Lazarus; yet Mr. Kneeland said that "it has no bearing on the subject in debate." In another place, he says, "But as I before observed, I do not view it as having any bearing upon the subject in discussion whatever." Again, "therefore, I say that the account of the rich man and Lazarus appears to me to have no relation to the subject of future happiness or misery whatever." He called my defence "a continued series of quotations, *without any argument*, to prove the meaning which was attached to them." In another place he calls it "bare assertion without proof or *even argument*." When Mr. Kneeland, regardless of my words, gives this account of my argument what sort of a report are we to expect from his *employed stenographer*, when professedly disregarding my words, and giving what he chooses to call my argument?

This plan is not only inconsistent with candor, but contrary to Mr. Jennings's express engagements to the public. In his communication for the Franklin Gazette, of August 7, he says, "now, Mr. Editor, I propose publishing both of their arguments *in full*, and together, *as they were delivered*." He did this because he considered the debate public property, as he says, "so soon as *the words* escaped the lips of the speakers." He says, "I am accountable to the disputants and to society for any thing I may add or detract from WHAT WAS SAID." After this declaration, a member of that society, to which he is accountable, shews him wherein he has detracted from "*what was said;*" and receives for answer that the reporter is "only bound to acknowledge errors which may be pointed out, *affecting the argument*." As Universalists consider the case of the rich man and Lazarus, and indeed most other scriptural proofs, as having no bearing upon the subject, the reporter has only to view them as not *affecting the argument*, and then dispose of them as he pleases, without, in his view, detracting from *what was said!* Is this catching the *words*, as they "escaped the lips of the speakers?" He did not promise my arguments in a mutilated form, but "in full;" he did not promise them as manufactured by an Universalist, but "as they were delivered."

On the cover of Mr. Jennings's last number, he can imagine no other reason for my condemning his Report, than that Mr. M'Calla "intends publishing the discussion himself!" As it is probable that the fear of rivalship in the money-making business has excited alarm, let him know that it was not for money that I faced Mr. Kneeland before an audience, and it is for a much higher object that I hope to meet him in the press. Although I have been at some expense, and it is lawful and honorable to seek an honest compensation for my labour, my publication is not to reimburse the one or reward the other. If God enable me to accomplish it, I hope to see an edition of two or three thousand copies About twenty-five supernumerary copies, not one of which should be sold, would satisfy my cupidity. This is all the profit that I claim. Except these, the profits of the whole edition, whether great or small, are to be appriopriated to the funds of the Young Men's Domestic Missionary Society, in this place. That this may be done in good faith, the pecuniary concerns of the publication, shall be committed to other hands. As this public declaration is necessary to obviate groundless surmise, and to inform purchasers that they will be feeding the poor, and not enriching me, it is hoped that it is not an ostentation of charity, in which grace I acknowledge with undissembled shame my inferiority to many brethren.

In the place above referred to, Mr. Jennings expresses serious apprehensions that I mean to avail myself of his Minutes in aid of my work. His fears are entirely vain. I would not copy such a mass of error and nonsense for tenfold his profits. Does he suppose that there is such a dearth of evidence, that we have to resort to a publication in which the wrong side is defended by one Universalist, and the right side by another? During the whole debate, I knew not that there was such a man as Mr. R. L. Jennings in the world. If I did not need his aid in speaking, I hope to write without him.

But he thinks me incapable of writing the discussion, because I took no notes of what Mr. Kneeland said, and paid but little attention to his speeches. A correct copy of the real discussion would be a very different book from that of Mr. Jennings. But this is not my object. I repeatedly declared that Mr. Kneeland had not done justice tohis cause; and that if permitted to finish the materials in my hands, I would engage to lay before the audience a better defence of Universalism than he had given. To confine my attention, then, to what he has said, or what he can say, would be a virtual refusal to meet the controversy in that stage to which it has advanced, and would disappoint the expectations of the public. Besides this, Mr. Kneeland and Mr. Jennings are very anxious that I should confine my attention to Mr. Kneeland's flimsy sophisms, tedious repetitions, and mourn-

ful complaints, uttered during the debate, that he may still boast that the writings of his favorite, Mr. Ballou, of Hartford memory, remain unanswered. In a spurious edition of Buck's Theological Dictionary, which has been, in no small degree, defiled by Mr. Kneeland's fingers, he boasts, concerning those productions and his own lectures, that "these works have never been answered, although some of them, particularly the two first, [Ballou on Atonement and his notes on parables,] have been published about twenty years and have gone through several editions."

Mr. Kneeland suppressed a part of my defence in his "own desk," as he calls the Lombard-street establishment, and Mr. Jennings seems exceedingly anxious that it may be suppressed forever. He appears to think that for me to print more than his master gave me leave to speak, would belong rather to the licentiousness than to the liberty of the press. This is perfectly in character. For, while infidelity boasts of its free-thinking, and heresy, of its liberality, they have always endeavoured, when they had it in their power, to suppress free inquiry. It is error in fact, and not true religion that is in danger, under the freedom of our happy institutions.

Among all Mr. Jennings's insinuations, it is pleasing to observe that he had not the temerity to assert that I had not the means of writing my own argument, especially as he would have been contradicted by his own employer. In his own report Mr. Kneeland says that his opponent "had his matter ready cut and dried to meet him;" that he had "not only the outlines, but the very body of his argument completely prepared before he came to the controversy;" "that on his part the discussion was completely prepared, in all its parts, before he came into this house." As Mr. Kneeland has revised Mr. Jennings's Minutes, and declared them "as faithful a report as ever was made," we shall allow the authenticity of what is there said in his name, whether it was said during the debate or not. He has had a full opportunity of improving his argument, and exerting his utmost strength. To his reasoning, as thus published, due attention may be given, at the same time that the arguments of Messrs. Ballou, Balfour and Chauncey, Winchester and Huntingdon, Kelly and Murray, shall be displayed to the best advantage, according to my feeble abilities.

The concession which Mr. Kneeland has made, of his opponent's having "*not only the outline but the very body of his argument*" "*completely prepared in all its parts,*" proves not only that I have the means of writing for myself, but the means of exposing Mr. Jennings's garbled report. This task is under-

taken for the purpose of defending the truth and detecting corruption, not to obstruct the circulation of his work; for it may do good, since he has retained some of my scripture proofs, notwithstanding all his unfairness. Neither do I undertake to point out all the errors of the work, for that would be to correct almost every line which it contains. It is true, there is a resemblance between my speeches and those which he has made for me; and so there is between a portrait and a caricature, or between a living animal and a dead animal; but as a living dog is better than a dead lion, so is an extemporaneous defence, fairly reported, preferable to that which Mr. Jennings has ascribed to me as the product of laborious preparation. This may be illustrated by a reference to a passage in which he has actually killed a very useful animal which was mentioned in my retort upon my opponent for endeavoring to expose my pronunciation to contempt and ridicule. After speaking of hearing a French gentleman pronounce the Latin, I asked among other things, "should I prick up my ears, as Sterne, in his Sentimental Journey, says an ass does, at every new object that he sees?" Here, no doubt, Mr. Jennings tried his stenographical skill; and you have the product of it in an erratum on the back of No. 4. It is as follows: "Should I have understood him as Sterne, in his Sentimental Journey, understood the owner of the *dead ass*, by the accent of his apostrophe to it?" Many impartial persons, like Drs. Ely and Wylie, would, from inattention and forgetfulness, think this a fair report. There is a manifest resemblance between the original and the copy. The likeness is at least as great as that which subsists between a man and a monkey. The same species of animal is mentioned by me, and reported by him. There is this difference, however, that while the beast was in my care, he was a living travelling ass, possessed of vivacity enough to start at every strange sight, as Mr. Kneeland started at every pronunciation except his own. But no sooner does he pass out of my hands, than this short-hand reporter makes short work of him; and finishes him more effectually with a single stroke of his pen, than his father Balaam could by the repeated strokes of his staff.

This is the way in which he has treated my whole array of argument and satire. Whatsoever animation they had in my hands, they are as tame as a troop of dead asses in his management. He has not done justice, nor any thing like justice, to my language, composition, sentiments, facts or arguments. In his report, my language is low, swaggering, and even spiced with profanity: and no wonder, for it is that of a universalist. My composition is vulgar, confused, incoherent, and as unintelligible as the above expression about "the owner of the dead ass

with the accent of his apostrophe to it." This is not wonderful, since it is the composition of an untutored young man, full of prejudice, and just commencing a profession for which he is not qualified. He has attributed to me sentiments and facts which are false in themselves, and which I never believed nor uttered. Is it to be expected, then, that he is a competent judge of what does and what does not affect my argument? After casting my words to the wind, as he has done, a sound argument in favour of that truth which he hates, can be no more appreciated by him than by his *little theologian at his elbow.*

As the task of examining such a mass of perversion is the more disagreeable the longer it is protracted, I shall not take time to detail the many false constructions of my meaning which he has substituted for my expressions. Neither will I notice many of his supplements to my quotations, in which he makes me appear very foolish, by quoting a great deal of scripture for me, where I quoted only a few words, and where a few were required by perspicuity, and candour required no more.

Numerous glaring interpolations also have greatly enervated the argument and stultified its author. In two or three cases he has quoted texts for me which appeared quite relevant; as Ez. 18: 20, 21, in page 39. This is true also of Matth. 13: 11, 12, in page 38. But he there adds the 15th verse, which is irrelevant. Isa. 65: 13, which he has given me in page 113, would do very well if he had put it among the contrasts: but it is inserted where it has nothing to do. These two last texts, which I never quoted, I now add to my notes. John, 2: 14, in page 262, is irrelevant. In page 51, he has given me a half a dozen verses of John's Revelation, in the same way. Also four verses of 1 Cor. in page 63; and in page 131, he has interpolated John 8: 24: In page 67, he inserted fifteen verses from Matt. and referred to a dozen more in Luke, about which I said nothing there. In page 131, he makes me talk about Greek and doctrinal parallels without any meaning. In page 126, he makes me quote the Greek of Matt. 24: 3, to show the meaning of a Hebrew word. This, however, is not more outrageous than his putting into my mouth that interpretation of Matthew's words which Unitarians adopt, and which I abhor. In the same heretical spirit; he has, in page 132, made me speak foolishly, falsely and irreverently of the resurrection of Christ, and to approve of Mr. Kneeland's erroneous translation of a Hebrew phrase, in page 153. The descant on regeneration, which he has composed for me in page 144, appears like a parable in the mouth of a fool. In page 202, he does not say that I attributed inspiration to Mr. Kneeland, but this would not have been more inconsistent with truth than to make me speak of "seventy *inspired*

translators;" or to make me promise, as in page 98, that I would not quote from Mr. Kneeland's Lectures any more.

Perhaps Mr. Jennings thought that his many additions on the one hand, might be balanced by his many suppressions on the other. In the latter, as well as the former, he has exercised a prudent discrimination. While he manages my speeches so as to make them savor of idiocy, he takes care to suppress Mr. Kneeland's puerile display of the new coat of his miniature testament; which, by the by, is not near half as small, nor as handsome, as one belonging to his despised opponent, who never thought of showing his toys. Neither did he tell us how many languages Mr. Kneeland could read, and how many he could not read for want of lexicons and grammars! Neither did he tell us in page 162, that besides Mr. Kneeland's "appeal to all and every learned person present," he challenged the city of Philadelphia after his accustomed fashion. In the same page he has suppressed Mr. Kneeland's declaration that the Hebrew expression in Daniel xii. 3, was the same as that in Psalms ix. 5, and that the conjunction *and* should be supplied in the latter, because it was found written in the former. To be consistent, he has jugulated my triumphant refutation of this sophistry in page 173. To make amends for this, however, he has made me say in page 153, that the very expression used in the Greek in Isaiah, is also used in Daniel xii. 2. After fabricating this statement for me, he takes occasion to contradict it in a learned Greek note. An anonymous writer in the Democratic Press, whom I know not, but whose fidelity should excite a blush in some of Mr. Jennings's ordained and graduated witnesses, seems astonished that in these days a man can write Greek before he can read it, and asks, *whence hath this man letters?* Mr. Jennings very sagaciously refers him to his little theologian, a little family dog, to solve the enigma. Our saviour and the apostles had a knowledge of languages by miracle, but not from such a quarter.

On the cover of No. 6, Mr. Jennings informs us with some emphasis, that he was the only one who "took notes during the *whole* of the debate." Yet in page 169, he tells us, "something is here wanting." The same anonymous writer who convicted him of another omission in the same page, has reminded him of suppressing the following expression of Mr. Kneeland, viz: "I observe the audience only hiss and clap when my opponent is up, and are silent when I am up, which I presume is from respect to me!" In page 288, he has taken no notice of his interrupting me, and of the colloquy which ensued upon the point whether it was of any use for me to prosecute my investigation of the word *everlasting* and its conjugates, since he admitted their uniform, unlimited meaning, for which I was contending. In page 300, he has suppressed the words of Rom. xvi. 11, and my real comment upon them. From my fifteen affirmative

texts, beginning on page 113, he has dropped an half dozen, and several others from my argument on the will of God, page 280. When he does this, he often fills up with texts of his own. This is the case in what he has said for me on *everlasting* and such words, where he has suppressed scores of texts, without "affecting the argument" in the least, as he would have us believe! In pages 207 and 249, he has given us a Universalist caricature of what I quoted from Gregory and Chrysostom, leaving out much which the audience cannot help remembering, when, if God permit, they shall see it in my printed argument.

To correct his report would be to write it over again in my own language and arrangement instead of his. The above are not near half of the errors which I have noted. That want of strength which Mr. Kneeland has informed the public prevents me from writing, hinders me from finishing at present. The most of these corrections are susceptible of ocular proof, in my notes which Mr. Kneeland has so abundantly authenticated. It is true that Mr. Jennings has adduced living witnesses against me. He has obtained and published in yesterday's Gazette, the certificates of Drs. Ely and Wylie, in company with those of Messrs. Hogan, Morse, Kneeland, Condie and Jennings! I confess I do not envy Dr. Wylie and Dr. Ely the company in which they are found, nor the business in which they are engaged. They have permitted themselves to be enlisted in the army of God's enemies, in an assault upon the truth and integrity of a man whose honesty and veracity they both believe to be unimpeachable, and whose reputation in these respects, Dr. Ely vindicated in the paper, after he knew my opinion and declarations concerning Mr. Jennings's report. As I never asked of these truly eminent and highly esteemed brethren, any other assistance than that of their prayers, their countenance and their books, the least that could be expected of them was, that if they would not throw their weight into the right scale, they would remain neutral. If the winning character of disinterested and candid witnesses has ensnared them, I would beg them to consider the *court* and the *cause* in which they have testified. God says, "be not a witness against thy neighbour without cause." Upon this infallible authority, the Scottish fathers of these gentlemen bottomed their testimony against the "Doeg-like sin" of being "either witnesses or members of inquest upon irrelevant libels." If, however, they had simply acted the part of witnesses, and testified what they could recollect, instead of adopting as their own, the manufactured testimony of one party, before hearing the other, who was sueing for a hearing, their conduct would have been unexceptionable. But they have now acted rather as judges than as witnesses. They knew that Mr. Jennings and myself were directly at issue on the purity of his report. He had been fully heard, and I had repeatedly, in

public and in private, promised a reply with all possible expedition. Mr. Kneeland had revised and authenticated the report which was published. It was desirable that the other party should have an opportunity of aiding the memories of these gentlemen as well as his opponent. They have already given their decision! and they know the consequence. Yet if the son of Alcnomac would not complain, why should the child of a KING whom Alcnomac never knew? I am not sorry that in much sickness and weakness, God enabled me to defend his precious truth, even if these brethren, after compelling me to self-defence, should make this a ground of an exterminating war. I know by sweet experience in whom I have trusted: "And when my father and my mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up."

W. L. M'CALLA.

Philadelphia, October 22, 1824.

No. 27.

In consequence of Dr. Ely's speech when taking the Moderator's chair, and his afterward certifying for Mr, Jennings, the Universalists are said to have greatly extolled his liberality, and to have boldly claimed him as one of their own honorable fraternity. This probably arose in part, from Mr Jennings's having circulated among them a grossly garbled copy of his certificate, which may be seen below in No. 29. But as the true copy, given above in No. 25, shows the Dr. in his real character, as a willing witness for orthodoxy, and a decided enemy to hypocrisy and heresy, Mr. Kneeland could not remain quiet under that weight of condemnation which the certificate left on him. He therefore unburthened himself in the following effusion: viz.

"DR. EZRA STILES ELY.

We thank this Rev. Doctor that he has been willing to let the world know his feelings towards "Mr. Kneeland"—that he "will show him any kindness in *his* power, AS A MAN.—Wonderful Doctor! Now if God is only as good as Dr. Ely, Mr. Kneeland is perfectly safe; and the Doctor's *squeamishness*, in conceiving himself "positively forbidden to countenance *him*, in any manner, *as a minister of the gospel*," is a matter of no concern, neither does it give Mr. K. the least uneasiness whatever. But would it not have been more becoming in this sapient "D. D." in speaking of Mr. K, "after knowing his sentiments," to have pointed out wherein they are erroneous, than to have insinuated, (as he has done without proof,) that he preaches an essentially *different gospel* from that contained in the bible? Of such men it may be truly said, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."

In this Mr. Kneeland seems to think that if God is as good as Dr. Ely, he is perfectly safe. Dr. Ely had said that he conceived himself positively forbidden to countenance Mr. Kneeland as a minister of the gospel; that he would not receive him into his house in the character of a servant of Christ. Now if God refuse, like Dr. Ely, to *countenance* Mr. Kneeland, does he think that the countenance of Mr. Morse and Mr Jennings will secure his safety? If God, like Dr. Ely, should refuse to receive this heretic, "in the character of *a servant* of Christ," does he think himself perfectly safe in the character of *an enemy* of Christ, or *a servant* of the devil? But Dr. Ely has refused to receive him into his earthly house, in his present guise. If God, like him, should exclude Mr. Kneeland from his house in heaven, does he think himself perfectly safe in the Lombard-street Church, the floors of which gave way during our debate?

No. 28.

FROM THE FRANKLIN GAZETTE.

Apology to Dr. Wylie.

DEBATE ON UNIVERSALISM.

Mr. NORVELL—As you have declined publishing for me for the future, accept my sincere thanks for past favors, and permit me to inform the public through your paper once more, that my argument on Universalism shall appear as soon as possible. Also permit me to make a public apology to Dr. Wylie for the strictures which lately appeared in your paper on his conduct. These were bottomed upon a mistaken supposition that although Mr. Jennings had reported my speeches falsely, he had reported his conversation fairly. This was not the fact, as the public shall see at a convenient time.

Yours, respectfully, WM. L. M'CALLA.

Philadelphia, October 30, 1824.

NOTE.—We have offered to continue to publish for all the parties engaged in the abovementioned controversy on the condition of paying for the insertion of their communications; a condition both reasonable and just.—*Franklin Gazette.*

No. 29.

Not satisfied with misrepresenting Dr. Wylie's testimony, Mr. Jennings lays violent hands upon Dr. Ely's certificate, as given in No. 25, and after cutting out passages which are,

in No. 30, quoted against him, publishes it, as thus altered, for Dr. Ely's certificate, without giving any notice of the suppressions which he had made! The following is a copy as published in p. 334 of his work, in a supplementary number.

The Rev. Dr. Ely, of the 3d Presbyterian Church, Pine-street, has certified as follows:

At the request of Mr. Jennings, I would state, that I have not been able, since the publication of his "Minutes of a Discussion," &c. to read more than *fifty pages* of the work, which is less than one sixth part of the whole. So soon as I can find time to read the whole, I shall freely communicate, at his request, my opinion of the same.—During the debate of Tuesday afternoon, July 13th, I was absent, so that I can only express an opinion on the first *forty pages*, and the short speech attributed to myself, on pages 234 and 235, concerning which I am free to declare, that I discover in these *forty-two pages*, so far as my memory serves me, no *important* error or omission. I think *the forty-two pages*, of which I now give my opinion, as just a statement of what was uttered in my hearing, as could be expected of any stenographer, who should attempt to follow men of ready utterance, in a debate of TWENTY HOURS.

Philadelphia, Oct 12, 1824. EZRA STILES ELY.

No. 30.

FROM THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

DEBATE ON UNIVERSALISM.

Mr. Jennings, in the Franklin Gazette of the 21st ult. thinking it of no avail to urge any longer the old refuted fables invented by envy and disappointed ambition, seeks to rest the whole cause upon two points; my calling him an employed stenographer, and my calling his Minutes a corrupt report: "presuming," says he, "that if I can show that the most prominent of his assertions are not founded on fact, it would only be intrusion to attempt to prove that the remainder are equally unfounded and unjust." On the first point he tells us that if Mr. M'Calla had "taken the pains to have enquired, he would have found that it was a Mr. Stetson who was engaged by the church, which engagement Mr. Stetson could not fulfil in consequence of the discussion being protracted longer than he could remain in the city; or for some other cause to me unknown." Let it be observed here, that Mr. Stetson was employed by the church, and not by Mr. Kneeland, and he declined the engagement and left the city before the debate was closed. This then was the time for Mr. Jennings to come forward with his proposals. In his next words

he plainly intimates that he had done so, and that my opposition commenced immediately after *he* and not Mr. Kneeland had offered the work to the public. His words are, "Immediately after *I had made known my intention* Mr. M'Calla appeared in your Gazette and stated that the work was unauthorized." Where was it that Mr. Jennings had *made known his intention* before I made this statement? No where that I have seen. Mr. Kneeland had *made known his intention* often enough. He had told us, July 21st, several days after the debate, and of course after Mr. Stetson had left the city, that "the WHOLE discussion has been taken down in short hand by a stenographer *employed* for the purpose." Mr. Jennings, in his last publication tells us that Mr. Stetson did not take notes of the *whole* but only a part of the discussion, and that Mr. Jennings was "*the only person* who had notes of the *whole* of the debate." Also on the cover of his sixth number he says "*no person* took notes during the *whole* of the debate *except myself.*" Who but Mr. Jennings then, can be Mr. Kneeland's *employed stenographer* who took down the *whole discussion*, since he from his own shewing, was the *only person* who had notes of *the whole debate?* But we are not here left to mere inference. That same Mr. Kneeland who had told us above that the *whole* discussion was recorded by a stenographer *employed* for the purpose, tells us in his notice of August 6th, that the Minutes were "taken in short hand by R. L. Jennings." He does not tell us that the church had employed him, but he acts in every stage of the business thus far, as if he himself had the sole control and the undivided responsibility of the undertaking. He does not tell us, as Mr. Jennings now does, that Mr. Stetson was the employed stenographer; for this would be impossible, because this employed stenographer had taken down the *whole* discussion, whereas Mr. Stetson recorded only a part. He does not tell us of any derangement of plan on account of Mr. Stetson's departure from the city, for it was after this departure that the whole discussion by this employed stenographer was first promised: but he announces the work once and again without any change of plan or workman, and in such a way, in one case, as to make the reader believe that it is published not by Mr. Jennings, but *the parties.* At last, when he tells us that the first number is in the press and proposes his terms of sale, I informed the public, to prevent a gross imposition, that the work was published by one party exclusively, and not authorized by me. In order to give an air of impartiality to the work, Mr. Kneeland then persuades the community that *he* had not authorized the work; but that without his having any thing to do with it, it was as faithful a report as ever was made. Then also for the first time, Mr. Jennings seems to emerge from his subordinate condition, and publicly to declare

himself "the *sole* publisher of the said debate, and as publicly disown being *engaged* with *either of the parties directly or indirectly.*" For believing Mr. Kneeland's assertion to the contrary, he accuses me of a high offence, and is willing that all our lesser matters of dispute should follow the fate of these two questions, is he an employed stenographer? is his report corrupt? My proof of the former is very simple, and although it rests upon the testimony of Messrs. Kneeland and Jennings, bad witnesses I confess, since they contradict themselves and one another, yet they ought to be good in a Universalist court, although disqualified by the constitution of Pennsylvania. Mr. Kneeland says that the whole discussion was recorded by an employed stenographer:—Mr. Jennings says that he was the only one who recorded the whole discussion:—Therefore he is the employed person. Accordingly his Master at last formally announces his name.

There is a way of corrupting a work of this kind without any of those grievous interpolations and suppressions which were exposed in the Franklin Gazette of the 23d ult. The strength of each part depends on its connexion, and every fact and argument will become nugatory, every anecdote and retort will become insipid. There is no difference between the best and the worst composition, when they are read across the columns of a newspaper. Not satisfied with transposing my remarks on the disorderly conduct of the Universalists, and thus introducing them where there is no call for them, he actually transposes his notice of the clapping and hissing of the audience which occasioned the animadversions of the parties. Near the middle of page 47, he tells us that there was "loud clapping, then hissing." Now it is a fact, which the audience will doubtless recollect, that this loud clapping took place just before "Mr. Morse sat down," and of course belongs to the middle of page 48. During the debate I observed that my opponent sometimes complained of my doing nothing but reading my little book, and at other times, that I did nothing but exercise my wit upon his speeches. This contradiction, I observed, reminded me of the fable of the traveller and the Satyr, the latter of whom drove the former from his cave (not hut, as Mr. Jennings has it,) for blowing hot and cold with the same breath. Mr. Jennings thinking that this was applicable in page 80, tells it there for me better probably than I told it myself; but in page 87 to which it really belongs, he merely refers to it, after making a confused and incorrect statement of the facts which occasioned me to relate it. A disputant who should speak as he has made me do in page 112, about the lion and the eagle might be suspected of an addled brain. This unsavoury omelet which he has mixed for me, is about equal to the barbecue with which he favoured us from Sterne's Sentimental Journey. In this place he does not give my authority, certain Scottish Reviewers

to whom I expressly referred for my real remarks, but he refers to them in page 86 where I said nothing about them.

In quoting a certain passage of Scripture I observed that it related to the end of the world. Mr. Kneeland immediately set to work to prove that this expression, *the end of the world*, did not mean what we usually understand by it. As these words were not in the text but only in my comment, I thought that Mr. Kneeland's criticism resembled one of Thomas Paine's which I had read more than a dozen years ago, on Job 37, 18. Without consulting the sacred text where he would have found that the word there used meant a *molten metallic mass*, Mr. Paine exercised his ingenuity upon our translation, *molten looking-glass;* to prove that the book of Job was written since the manufacture of glass was discovered. The only time that I used this illustration was in connection with an argument which Mr. Jennings professes to give in page 97, where the illustration is not found, but only an indefinite reference to it as having been given before. Turning back, we find it transposed to page 86, and attached to a foolish observation carved out of something that I said, but to which it is no illustration at all. He probably observed also that my reference to the metallic mirrors of the ancients was clumsy and obscure. For the sake of perspicuity, he makes me say that "the original does not signify glass, but something as transparent as glass!" Transparent metallic mirrors! He might as well have made me talk of transparent millstones.

Mr. E. of Maysville, Ky. once lent me a little work on Universalism which supposes the case of a poor afflicted widow reading Scarlett's translation of 2 Cor. 4-17, and enquiring of him what he meant by *aeonian* in that text. On Thursday afternoon of the debate, I recounted this case as one which I had read. Mr. Kneeland insinuated that the case was manufactured for the occasion; and asked why I did not use the name of Kneeland at once, as that was what I meant. The next morning I commented upon 2 Cor. 5-1, and supposed the case of a sinful and miserable man like myself instead of the widow, going to Mr. Scarlett; or, as my opponent seemed to prefer it, suppose that I should go to Mr. Crimson, to enquire the meaning of this celebrated word aionian. This was undoubtedly the first instance, and, unless I am egregiously mistaken, it was the only instance in which the word *crimson* was thus used. Yet in page 250 where this case is reported, this word is not found. Turning back to pages 224, 247, we find it tranposed to the case of the widow, and twice used in that connexion where it was never mentioned.

Besides all the errors which have been already exposed, notes are now before me of more than four score instances of palpable alterations, some of them affecting the argument, and

all affecting the character of the speaker for understanding or probity. This remark is not intended as an acknowledgement of the purity of the report in other places, where his alterations are less observable, nor is it intended as an intimation that the public indulgence shall be taxed by a multiplicity of specifications. It shall be taken for granted, that if a suitable proportion of these spurious speeches can be invalidated, this will sufficiently prove, according to Mr. Jennings' rule, "that the remainder are equally unfounded and unjust." But this will appear much more plainly when those who heard the debate shall compare Mr. Jennings' report with my argument. For this work we shall wait, to shew my real division which he has so transformed in page 22; and my real criticism which he has pretended to copy in pages 284 and 324, and other places. In page 220, he appears disposed to make a solemn subject ludicrous, at my expense, and at the expense of truth. In illustraing Paul's expression, *before the everlasting times*, by an expression of the same writer, *far above all heavens*, I had occasion to tell the audience of the ærial and etherial heavens, and the heavens of heavens. My first heavens, the atmosphere of our earth, in which birds fly, Mr. Jennings makes the residence of God and sometimes God himself. My second heavens, in which the sun, moon and stars are fixed, he makes the residence of the Son of God, or the Divine Son himself. My third heavens the abode of God and saints and angels, he makes the residence of angels only. His making me refuse to pray for Universalists, under pretence that they had committed the unpardonable sin is not the only error that can be plainly proved in page 81. Nor is his manner of introducing Epicurus who died for fear of poverty, when he was worth 70,000 sesterces, a solitary error in page 183.

Mr. Jennings thinks himself a witness between the parties in some matters of fact, and therefore has a special eye on these in his report. As Mr. Kneeland continued to the last day, to inform the audience of his want of matter to fill up his time, I informed them on that day, after one of these complaints, that as I had much more to say than the time allotted would allow, I should be much obliged to my opponent for such *crumbs* of his half-hours as he could spare. This had a bearing upon the question whether I was allowed time to finish my argument or not. Mr. Jennings therefore in page 259, converts it into a compliment to Mr. Kneeland's superior learning, without the least reference to my want of time. His words are the following, viz: "And although I may not have the learning of my opponent to make converts of you all, yet I hope he will give me the *crumbs* which fall from his table." It is evident that he

noted the word *crumbs*, with his boasted "powers of the stenographic art," and then made the rest as he pleased.

It will be recollected that after my remarks about Mr. Kneeland's Greek Grammar of which I spoke from information obtained in the house during the debate, I was immediately corrected as to the matter of fact. It was said that he had not *written* it. My reply was, "Perhaps, then he published it without writing it, as I have indirect evidence that he did with his Lectures and Translation." In page 202, which is full of errors, Mr. Jennings makes me say "Perhaps he meant it was published without having been written at all!" In Mr. Kneeland's letter of the 13th ult. to Dr. Ely, he says, concerning me, "he stated during the discussion that I had *written* and *published* a Greek Grammar, which is *totally* incorrect." TOTALLY INCORRECT!! That is he neither *wrote* a Greek Grammar, nor *published* a Greek grammar; for if he did either the one or the other, the remark attributed to me is not *totally* incorrect, but half of it is true. Which then is the greatest crime, for me to say, through mere mistake, that my opponent wrote a book which he had really published, or for him knowingly to deny the fact of publishing? But it will be recollected by the audience that I frequently requested to be corrected where mistaken in stating the words, sentiments, or acts of my opponent. Of these requests it is not observed that the impartial Mr. Jennings has taken any notice.

After Mr. Kneeland had tried a variety of arts, with but little success, to divert me from an argument which he could not withstand, he introduced a certificate of Harry Starr, a promising young satellite of our Universalist luminary, to prove that I had announced to a brother clergyman a determination "to plague him by playing off," and that I "would not come to the point." Without recording all the features of dissimulation exhibited in this transaction, it may be observed that my opponent manifested a determination to make me spend my precious time in combatting this slander, or submit to its stain. For this purpose he says, in page 216, "I hope therefore, my opponent will not fail to prove the contents of the note which I have read not to be true. If he fail to do this, what will be your decision?" As this was a mere scheme to enable Mr. Kneeland to *play off* from the point, and to *plague* his antagonist, I determined to stick to the argument and pay but little attention to Harry, although I had a certificate of the clergyman in question to prove an *alibi*, and the testimony of four persons present when Starr received his information, to show that the light that was in him was darkness. I therefore contented myself with telling the audience on the last day emphatically, that this was a *fabrication*, got up for a particular purpose. In Mr. Jennings's report of this concise notice in page 244, he has omitted this emphatical

expression. Just before my opponent read his formidable communication, three anonymous letters were put into my hands. Although I took no written minute, memorandum or note of them nor ever said that I had, Mr. Jennings says for me in page 217, "I have on my *Minutes* a *memorandum* of some notes which I also have received."

As my opponent occupied much of his time in complaining of my little book, I showed it to the audience, observing that it contained three sheets of letter paper folded into 96 pages, five of which were blank, and so many others unused, that all my notes in the debate did not probably occupy more than two sheets and a half. The report makes this the size of the whole volume, and the pages to amount to thirty. This is about as true, however, as the profanity which he has attributed to me shortly after in page 87.

If Mr. Kneeland did not succeed in exposing my pronunciation, his *employed* stenographer has effectually done it. In page 168 he has given me a *z*. for my sibilant *s*. and an *a-w* for my German aspirate. In the next page he attributes to me a guttural instead of a nasal sound. In the foregoing page he makes me say that in the pronunciation of Hebrew I agreed with Dr. Wilson, whereas I said that Parkhurst was my guide, from whom Dr. Wilson differed. In page 185, he makes me name Dr. Wilson, as a more learned man than Dr. Campbell of Scotland, whereas I only referred to him as *a gentleman of this city*, who had been mentioned by my opponent with Dr. Campbell, and of whom I had that opinion; but did not give his name.

In a certain case I had to remind my opponent that the Moderators were only to decide on matters of *order*. In page 171, he makes me say that the Moderator "sits here as a judge of plain matter of *fact* and nothing else!" To give a detailed account of all such alterations as these would be more than the public would bear, and certainly more than is necessary for their satisfaction as to the real character of the report. In page 173, he gives me Dr. James, a President of a college in Scotland, instead of Dr. Jamieson, who was no President. In 186, he changes Dr. Miller into Professor Stuart. In the same page he makes me speak of David's writings instead of his dead body. In the next page he changes an *escape* into a *surrender* and *always* into *very seldom*. In page 173, he omits a modern Dr. M. whom I expressly mentioned, and gives me *Priestley's Corruptions* instead of *Miller's Letters to Baltimore*. In page 282, he makes me compliment the candour of Kneeland instead of M'Knight; and in 223, makes me say that I, instead of my opponent, had quoted Parkhurst. In page 279, he makes me say that in the refutation of Universalist writers, I would use their arrangement instead of my own. In page 80, he has, besides

many other capricious turns, changed *backs* into *bosoms*, and *my hearers* into *his Indians*. In page 205, he has changed Old England to New England, and in the bottom of 298, has substituted the Scriptures for my little book. For a Hebrew translation of the New Testament which I had just borrowed, he has in page 218, substituted a Greek Testament, and has, of course, changed my *Sheol*, intended to counteract an assertion of my opponent, for *Hades* which has no application. This, however did not *affect the argument* more than changing Hebrew into Greek and Greek into Hebrew, both of which he has done in page 153. As Mr. Kneeland declared sin to be a *mere negation*, I observed that to condemn or punish it, would be like condemning a vacuum or punishing a man for an empty stomach. Without *affecting the argument*, as Mr. Jennings supposes, he has made me say, that "It would be like attempting to clear a vacuum, or like administering *an emetic* to clear an empty stomach!" As the Report in general has much the effect of the antimonial preparation, more than half the glaring alterations which have been noted must be dispensed with. To save time in this disgusting occupation, my references to most of the cases have been very short and therefore obscure. This arises from his having not only altered the particulars referred to, but almost every thing connected with them. Unless therefore, the whole passage is restored to its original purity, the restoration of the word to which I refer, would appear as unaccountable as to see Saul among the prophets, or a Presbyterian minister of the highest standing associated with a herd of Universalist witnesses.

I have neither time nor disposition to enumerate the many deviations from truth which have been proved against Mr. Morse in the public prints. I would only suggest to his biographer, that he can borrow from Smollet a very suitable title for his memoirs. Let them be called "The Adventures of an Atom." Mr. Kneeland, a party, and Mr. Jennings, his employed stenographer, are well known. Mr. Condie is one of those who, in great wrath and disappointment, called me *a liar* at the close of the debate. As this indecent conduct was occasioned by the triumph of truth, I was more amused at the livid hue with which rage had adorned his countenance, than I was hurt at his words. His testimony manifests the same zeal in the same cause. With Mr. Kneeland he is delighted to make the Report an exhibition of my peculiar *style* and *manner*; and with Dr. Wylie's certificate coined by Mr. Jennings, he even makes it give my *very words* and *expressions*. Although this is what Mr. Jennings at first promised, he has long given it up, and taken refuge under the *argument* without the *words* Even the modest Mr. Kneeland says in his certificate, "in *many places* I can perceive some

verbal difference," and Dr. Ely certifies, that "Mr. Jennings does not pretend, in every instance, to give the words of the speakers." It would be well for the witnesses to agree with one another and not to give the reporter more credit than he claims.

With one breath Mr. Jennings tells us that he has "merely given an outline" of Dr. Ely's speech, and with the next, expresses great indignation at my calling his report of it "an invented address." The evidence of my own ears, of others who were present, and Dr. Ely's own declarations, must form my apology. Although I was myself a witness, both parties were heard before my opinion was publicly expressed. The reason which Dr. Ely gave for correcting his piece at all was the very same which was given by an eminent minister of this city, mentioned in my last article. It was an unwillingness that any thing injurious to religion, should be published with his name attached to it. He declared to me expressly, "If Mr. Jennings has reported you as he has me, you have good reason to complain." Long ago he gave me privately the same opinion of the first number which his certificate contains. I told him that he would not always believe so. By way of specimen I asked him what he thought of Mr. Jennings's report of my division in page 22, compared with the report which I should then give him. Mr. Jennings says, that I undertake to "prove the absolute and eternal punishment of the wicked, 1st, by the scriptures; 2dly, from the account which they contain of the attributes of God; and 3dly, from the condition of fallen man." My report of the division was this: 1, Inference; 2, Implication; 3, Contrast; 4, Negation; 5, Affirmation. The comparison convinced him that Mr. Jennings was wrong, although he had not before observed it. The day after the publication of the certificates, Mr. Jennings's *dead ass* was presented to Dr. Ely and Dr. Wylie as another specimen, with the same result.

This last mentioned gentleman, like Dr. Ely, told me long ago, that he could discover no error in the report, but like him he could detect one when pointed out; and when he gave his opinion to Mr. Jennings he did not recollect, if he ever knew, my intention of giving my side of the question in relation to the particulars of the Minutes. I could not obtain an interview with him until my last article was in the office, and probably set up, or my remarks concerning him should have been of a very different character If he had really spoken as Mr. Jennings reports, I could still say of him and Dr. Ely, notwithstanding this injury, that they are "truly eminent and highly esteemed brethren." But although Dr. Wylie gave this *fair* and *impartial* reporter liberty to "make any proper use he pleased" of his real opinion concerning the Minutes, he did not give him leave artfully to make a false impression concerning the conversation, as he has

done so often concerning my speeches. In a letter to me of the 25th ult. from which a few words have just been quoted, the Dr. says, "*Truth obliges me to remark* that the various items of the conversation between Mr. Jennings and me above stated, have been *rather artfully put together*. To the best of my recollection, the word 'although' together with the two underscored expressions, are *inferences of his own*. At all events, I have no hesitation to say that the statement, taken *tout ensemble*, conveys *a different meaning from what was intended*. Judge yourself, whether the premises [the foregoing narrative in the letter] warrant such a conclusion. The manner in which these truths are stated by Mr. Jennings, seems to present the air of a strong conviction of conscientious obligation to come forward and state the *truth* in evidence against Mr. M'Calla, a man *whose veracity I believe unimpeachable. Very contrary to this was the fact.*" Here then is the amount of Dr. Wylie's testimony. Mr. Jennings asked his opinion of his minutes of two hours and an half of the debate, while as yet the other party was not heard. Dr. Wylie confesses that he can see no fault in it, and gives him liberty to make any proper use of this declaration. This faithful reporter then cooks it into a certficate, in which he reports the Dr. as saying, that "*truth obliges him to declare* that he cannot discover the least difference *even in expression.*" The Dr. now speaks for himself, and says that *truth obliges him to remark* that this pretended obligation to give a premature testimony, and this exactness of the Report "*even in expression,*" given to him by the reporter, are *inferences of his own;* that the items of the conversation have been *rather artfully put together*, and that the statement altogether *conveys a different meaning from what was intended*, and one *very contrary to fact*. If all this is said by Mr. Jennings's own witness concerning his report of a few sentences, what are we to expect in a report of a twenty hours's debate.

The testimony of Dr. Ely, taken altogether, is not much more favourable. But if it were, the Universalists are the last who should claim the benefit of it, since they have in their spleen, denied him the essential qualifications of a witness. It will be recollected that Mr. Kneeland, in his letter of the 13th of September, attributed to him insinuations which he said were "far beneath the dignity of either the gentleman or the christian." To keep from ascribing such language to "a heart desperately wicked," he is forced by the sweet impulse of charity, to conclude that it does not proceed "from a mind that is sound." Yet not many months after laying aside his testimony in my favour, on the pretended ground of lunacy, he is produced against me without any perceivable change for the better. It is true, I am willing to admit him as a witness; every one knows him, as well as

Dr. Wylie, to be one of the greatest lights of our country; every body knows that when Mr. Kneeland accused him of unsoundness, and when Mr. Morse accused Mr. Magoffin, and when Mr. Ballou accused me, they did not believe what they said, for we should all be very sound, if we would go over to their side; yet they ought to know that when they have committed themselves by such gross, guilty, slanderous dissimulation, they ought, for decency's sake, to preserve a small degree of consistency, and not to disqualify a witness one moment and summon him the next.

Where now are those hundreds of witnesses whose testimony Mr. Kneeland told us "could be obtained if it were necessary, of its being as faithful a report as ever was made?" I am informed that general orders were given from the pulpit and the press for their battallions to muster with all possible speed. On the cover of the last number of the Report, Mr. Jennings "earnestly requests every individual" who is willing, to send his certificate "as soon as possible to the office of the Saturday Evening Post, or to the residence of the publisher." It was prudent to name two places, as one could hardly be expected to contain the certificates of so many hundreds. The roll is called, and the faithful brethren, Messrs. Kneeland, Jennings, Morse, Hogan and Condie are found in their places. Now, gentlemen, are you willing to certify that this is "as faithful a report as ever was made?" Is it as faithful as some made by Mr. Stansbury, Reporter to Congress? Mr. Morse and Mr. Hogan, speak your minds, for you must understand this matter well, as you gaped and yawned and looked out of the window so much while the Kentuckian was speaking. They testify that the report is "without any omissions or additions affecting the arguments:" and remember that this school does not consider even the case of Lazarus and the rich man as affecting the argument. Well Mr. Kneeland, can you admit any flaws? Be cautious now, and do not expose us. "In many places I can perceive some verbal difference." What! is this the character of "as faithful a report as ever was made?" If *you* go that far, what may we not expect from the other party? Dr. Condie, you are READY ENOUGH, it is true, but your testimony is not worth much for that very reason. In this sad condition, they were no doubt much refreshed with the testimony made for Dr. Wylie by Mr. Jennings, and with that of Dr. Ely whom they had before rejected as unsound. Since its publication, Dr. Ely's opinion has been directly opposed by witnesses of equal respectability, and I hope will be changed by himself when he has heard both sides.—The injury done to Dr. Wylie by his reporter, I confess, does not give me great pain, since it proves Mr. Jennings unfaithful in a

little, and of course not to be trusted in much. It has also made me better acquainted with a man whose forbearance, conscientiousness, candour, and tenderness of affection I hope to imitate, and whose society and friendship I desire to enjoy in this, wilderness and in the land of promise.

W. L. M'CALLA.

Philadelphia, Nov. 4, 1824.

DEFENCE.

PART FIRST.

The question which has called us together involves an essential doctrine of Christianity. Hence arises, in part, my great willingness to engage in its discussion. For the lawfulness of such an undertaking we have the authority of God's word, apostolical precedent, and the example of the Reformers; of whom Martin Luther held a debate of ten days with the Pope's Legate, at Leipsic; and Melancthon, Calvin and Knox had their public conferences with the ecclesiastics of the establishment to which they were opposed. These do not necessarily give scope to evil passions more than written controversy. This method of defending the truth may, in certain circumstances, be conducted as decently and as profitably as the other plan. Yet if my conduct in the commencement or prosecution of this enterprise be censurable, I wish it to be explicitly stated and understood that the blame is my own exclusively. As I am not considered responsible to my brethren in this particular, they cannot be at all implicated in the business. My only desire is, that if God enable me to speak for edification, he alone may have the praise. On the Triune God of Israel is my only dependence. Willingly do I confess my natural depravity, and inability to do any thing acceptable to God, or profitable to his people, except by the grace of a risen Saviour, and by the help of the Holy Spirit.

Among those errorists who deny the eternity of future punishment, there are two general descriptions—the Destructionists who believe in the annihilation of the wicked, and the Universalists who believe in their eternal happiness. Some inspired men, as Job and Jeremiah, have, in the bitterness of their souls, lamented over their own existence, and appeared to think, with the suicide, that annihilation was preferable even to the sufferings of this life, and of course preferable to the eternal and the insupportable wrath of God, threatened in his word. This system is equally opposed to the scriptural account of degrees in

punishment; which we are certainly taught by our Saviour in his sermon on the mount, where he dooms one to the judgment, another to the council, and a third to hell fire; the servant who sinned against knowledge to the punishment of many stripes, and him who sinned ignorantly to comparatively few stripes; and those who despise the gospel to a more intolerable punishment than that of Sodom and Gomorrah. Annihilation admits of no degrees, nor does it admit of that consciousness of existence and apprehension of the existence of an indignant Creator, which the Scriptures attribute to the condemned sinner, when it is said, "ye shall know that I am the Lord." "He shall reward him and he shall *know* it." "Ye shall *know* that I the Lord have poured out my *fury* upon you."

Among Universalists there is a great variety. Some believe in a limited punishment in the future world, others confine it to this life. In each of these sects, there is a variety of sentiments concerning the description of punishment to be inflicted, some considering it condign, others penitentiary, others disciplinary. My opponent passes for a Universalist and not a Destructionist. He professes to belong to that sect which confines punishment to this life, and to that class which considers punishment disciplinary, that is, intended for the good of the subject. His sentiments and my own, may be seen in the question which we have adopted for discussion, and the several clauses of which, we have espoused respectively. "Is the punishment of the wicked absolutely eternal? or is it only a temporal punishment in this world for their good, and to be succeeded by eternal happiness after death?" The affirmative of the latter clause advocated by my opponent is a denial of a future state of rewards and punishments It presents Universalism in its most daring aspect, but only in that degree of turpitude to which every description of this error naturally leads. Unconnected with materialism, as it certainly is, in the phraseology of the question, this system would send the antediluvian rebels to Heaven before Noah, the Sodomites before Lot, the Egyptians before Moses, Korah, Dathan and Abiram before Aaron, the Canaanites before Joshua, the blaspheming thief before the Apostles, and Judas before Christ. Did these holy characters need more punishment for discipline, for repentance, or for satisfaction than those rebels who died before them? or was there any thing in the

duration or intensity of their sufferings, which would give to the death of these rebels an extraordinary efficacy? In general their pains were neither very tedious nor very severe. The experience of many can attest that there is comparatively little pain in drowning: The agony is in coming to again. Whether those who perished in the general deluge and in the Red Sea were disciplined into holiness by their death, we may conjecture by the example of the Canaanites and many others who suffered much, before their death, and were only hardened under the means of softening, and blasphemed God on account of their plagues.

The several systems which have been described are so nearly related, that they may harbour the advocates of each other, without any material change of ground; as a prisoner may go from one cell to another, without escaping from confinement. In this they resemble the Arians and Socinians, whose subtle vacillations have been exposed by Wardlaw of Scotland and Miller of America. "When they feel pressed by a text or an argument which bears hard on the Socinian hypothesis, they take refuge in Arianism, and endeavour to maintain that the difficulty vanishes, on the plan of the pre-existence and super-angelick nature of Christ, as held by Arians. On the contrary, when pressed by a passage of Scripture, or a consideration, which wears an aspect unfavourable to Arianism, they can with equal dexterity avail themselves of the Socinian doctrine, and argue with the lowest Humanitarian." The younger Edwards has shewn that Dr. Chauncey has been guilty of the same tergiversation in the Universalist controversy. While professedly defending the doctrine of a future penitentiary punishment, he is not ashamed, in passing certain fortresses, to hoist the colours of the Destructionists. My opponent also, in the 206th page of his Lectures, appears to adopt a similar policy, in order to escape the force of Matt. 10: 28, and Luke 12: 5, which direct us to fear God, who, "after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell" In this passage my opponent sees two difficulties. One is that God hath power to cast into hell. This he removes in a note, by saying, "because God *has power* to destroy, it does not necessarily follow that *he will*." But knowing that this assertion is a direct contradiction of the word of God, which says that he will "destroy them that destroy the earth," and that with an "everlasting destruction;" and recollecting also

that the second difficulty in the text is that this takes place, not in this life, but "after he hath killed," my supple opponent seeks relief by resorting to that very use of the word *destroy*, which gave to the Destructionists their distinctive appellation. His words are these; "But I have no objection *in* the supposition that this text is to be understood in a higher sense; and that it refers to the sovereignty of God, who has power, as all will admit, to render any *being* whom he hath made, *extinct*. He who created man, is able to *destroy* him in every sense in which he *exists* as man." Here he explains the scriptural threatening of the *destruction* of the wicked, to mean *the destruction of his existence, the extinction of his being*, which is *annihilation*.

My opponent is equally wavering as to the reason why our Creator punishes the wicked. In his Lectures and in that clause of the question which he has undertaken to defend, he represents God as all mercy, punishing the wicked only for their good. In that brief summary of the Universalist faith which is annexed to the system of psalmody used (as I understand) by that society in this place, God is represented as an inexorable judge, without any forgiveness except upon the ground of our making full satisfaction to the law by our own sufferings. The words are "We believe it to be consistent with the character and government of God, and perfectly consonant to the design of his law, to punish all wilful offenders, and to administer to every transgression and disobedience a just recompence of reward." That my opponent sometimes preaches this doctrine of a condign instead of a disciplinary punishment may be seen in the 35th page of his duodecimo sermon published in the present year, where he declares that "all the hell there is, (and we believe in all the punishment of which the scriptures speak,) is *inevitably certain* to the wicked: and their portion in this 'lake of fire and brimstone,' in these 'sorrows of death,' and 'pains of hell,' not only is, but ever will be, *in exact ratio to the measure and magnitude of sin*. It is on this principle that God rewards every man according to his works" The same adherence to the doctrine of satisfactory punishment is found in the spurious edition of Buck's Theological Dictionary. My opponent has there said, under the article "Universalists," that "they contend that the wicked receive a punishment *proportioned to their crimes*." I should like to know what the condign punish-

ment of the wicked means, if it is not that which is "proportioned to their crimes," and "in exact ratio to the measure and magnitude of sin." When this is laid upon an adequate surety, and the offending individual is pardoned, there is an exercise of mercy; "for to the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses," "keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the *guilty*." Yet when this punishment is laid upon the offenders themselves, and full satisfaction is exacted from them, however just it is, there is no display of mercy intended in it. In this plan there is no room for Christ, although the scriptures say "through him is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." My opponent, not satisfied with thus contradicting the Gospel of Christ, "in whom we have forgiveness of sins," contradicts himself in the very next words to those last quoted. by saying "that punishment itself is *disciplinary*, and not inconsistent with *mercy*." What! is it an exercise of mercy to inflict upon all men, in their own persons, "a punishment proportioned to their crimes?" Is it like parental discipline to punish all men individually "in exact ratio to the measure and magnitude of sin?" Is there no room for "repentance and remission of sins?" "Is there no balm in Gilead, is there no physician there?" In the gospel we are taught that God inflicts a condign punishment upon our Divine surety, and a disciplinary chastisement upon those whose sins are fully and freely forgiven through his blood: but when my opponent, leaving a Saviour out of view, attempts, in the very same sentence, to make these two descriptions of punishment meet in the individual offenders, he shows either the most licentious inconsistency, or a want of acquaintance with the plainest terms in technical theology.—Yet great as the incongruity of these two systems is, they are not more at war with each other than they are with scripture and common sense, when, as at present, they reject the doctrine of future punishment. How can that man be said to receive in this life, either a disciplinary or a satisfactory punishment for the most heinous crime, in the very perpetration of which he dies instantaneously? How can either of these punishments be inflicted on a suicide, in this life, for a crime which, in the very act, removes him beyond this life?

It is hardly necessary to shew the multiplied inconsisten-

cies of my opponent by reminding you that on this very occasion, he has added a *penitentiary* punishment to the descriptions mentioned already. He has promised that if I prove the first clause of our question, he will then "prove that the punishment of the sinner is only temporal and salutary, to be succeeded by his *repentance* and never ending happiness."* Without dwelling on the impossibility of a suicide's repenting in this life, of a crime which, in a twinkling, terminates his life, I would observe that this shifting of the question from one system of Universalism to another, is effectually precluded by the question adopted by the parties. One of the most remarkable characteristics of a Christian is, that he is willing to make a distinct and unequivocal profession of his faith in the presence of the universe. But the anxiety of my opponent to secure opportunities of shuffling has led him into a most pitiable, though abortive attempt,† to elude the trammels which our rules have placed upon him, by confining him to one particular scheme of error.

But why should he so repeatedly‡ make my proving the first clause of the question a prerequisite to his attempting the establishment of the second? Are they not substantially one question? Is not the establishment of eternal punishment a refutation of Universalist limitations? And if these limitations be proved, does not my system fall of course? The only reason why the second clause was proposed on my part, was to compel my opponent to take a decided stand with that particular sect and class of Universalists to which he chose to belong. This stand he has taken by the very fact of adopting the question. If the transaction be insincere, let the censure lie upon the guilty person.

It seems also strange that my opponent should, in the commencement of this discussion,§ complain that my first half hour did not contain more evidence, and that he should throw the blame of his sterility upon my supposed remissness. Let the cause be what it may, his complaints are truly doleful. In order to the application of a remedy, let the evil be well understood. It is described in his own words, as follows, viz: "But as he has brought forward nothing for me to answer, nothing in support of his argument, I have nothing to refute. I do not know even how to consume my thirty minutes." "I feel anxious to consume my thirty minutes, but in truth, I know not what

* Minutes, p. 44.
† Minutes, p. 15.
‡ Minutes, pp. 28, 44.
§ Minutes p. 15.

to say."* This, then, is the evil; he has nothing to say; he knows not how to fill up his time. If this sorrow be imputed to my mode of managing the controversy, I will endeavour to supply his deficiencies by the aid of Universalist authors, and thus give a better defence of Universalism than my opponent has done. In the fear of God, this shall be done in a conscientious way, by selecting the several heads of argument, which our antagonists advance against us, and by marshalling their scripture authorities adduced in support of these arguments, to the best advantage, beginning with the weakest and ending with the strongest. This is not only the most honest but the most politic plan; because if their best array *cannot* be defeated, we had better capitulate at once, and if it *can* be overthrown, it had better be done immediately.

UNIVERSALIST CANONS.

Preparatory to this measure, it is necessary to pay some attention to the numerous factitious rules of exegesis by which the Universalist writers deceive themselves and others. The proof which God has condescended to give will not answer their purpose. They must have such as they choose in their sovereignty to demand. The Jews disregarded our Saviour's miracles, and said, "let him now come down from the cross and we will believe him." So these authors disregard volumes of plain inspired evidence, and demand that which would be exactly right to their perverted judgments, which take wrong for right and right for wrong. In this view they require that our proofs should be drawn from the right book and the right part of the book. These texts must be in a right style, the same as the context; and of a right composition. invulnerable to heretical conjecture. These rules are recognized by my opponent, in the 209th page of his Lectures, in a note which he has copied from the improved Unitarian Version of 2 Pet. 2: 4, which informs us that "God spared not the Angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell." The following are his words; viz "If God spared not the messengers who had sinned, i. e. the spies who were sent to explore the land of Canaan, &c. See Simpson's Essays, p. 205, &c. But if the common interpretation be admitted, it will not establish the popular doctrine concerning fallen angels. For, 1. The epistle itself is of doubtful authority! 2. From the change of style, this is the most doubtful portion of the epistle! 3. By

* Minutes, pp. 27, 30.

those who admit the genuineness of the epistle, this chapter is supposed to have been a quotation from some ancient apocryphal book, and the Apostle might not mean to give authority to the doctrine, but to argue with his readers upon known and allowed principles!" So it seems of no avail for us to prove the genuineness, authenticity and inspiration of our authorities, if even a nameless heretic can be quoted, by whom it is *supposed* that the writer did not mean what he said! Thus do these modern Pharisees and Sadducees make void the law of God by their traditions and impious conjectures.

Besides these things, they demand in our authorities, what they or their friends *suppose* to be the right words and phrases, subject, and sense; with a right extent of reference and address; by a right number of authors, and a right frequency of repetition; and *that* at what they *suppose* to be the right times. In Hebr. 7: 16, we find the word *endless* or *indissoluble** in connection with life. In the 223d page of my opponent's lectures, he says, "if this word could have been so much as once found connected with death, in the same manner as it is here connected with life, it would have given more support to the doctrine of endless misery, than all that is contained in the Bible besides." He now asks,† "why did they [the inspired writers] not make use of this term about the meaning of which there could be no dispute?" He makes the same high sounding demands‡ concerning the phrase§ which is, in Isa. 45: 17, translated *world without end.* He says, "If he [his antagonist] can, let him, find the passage in which the words are found in connection with punishment, misery, or death, and again I say, I will give him the argument, and our discussion will end." Thus my opponent will not believe the truth, however plainly declared in Holy Writ, unless it is revealed in such words and phrases as he shall dictate; and he takes care to dictate such as he thinks can never be found in that connection. Neither would he yield, if all his demands were complied with; as is evident from his refusing so to do, when through the suggestion of a friend, Ps. 9: 5, was quoted, in which the Hebrew phrase¶ used in connection with punishment, is, according to his own acknowledgment, equivalent to the expression used in Isa. 45: 17, in connection with happiness.

---

* αναταλυτος

† Minutes, p. 105.

‡ Minutes, pp. 175. 181. 252.

§ עד עולמי עד

¶ לעולם ועד

After one Universalist has directed the inspired penman what word to use, it is no wonder that another should dictate the subject of his whole discourse. Balfour, in the 3d section of his enquiry, will not admit that the "damnation of hell," spoken of in Matt. 23: 33, can mean an eternal punishment, because the whole discourse is not exclusively confined to eternal subjects. He says that it "occurs in the fullest and plainest discourse ever uttered by our Lord concerning the temporal miseries coming on the Jewish nation." "How comes it to pass that if the damnation of hell means eternal misery, it should only be introduced in such a discourse?" It might as well be asked how 'our daily bread" can mean bodily nourishment, when spiritual blessings are evidently the chief subject of the Lord's prayer. Throughout the whole Bible, temporal and eternal things are connected as they are in 1 Tim. 4: 8, where godliness is said to have the "promise of the life that now is; and of that which is to come."

But if these writers cannot keep the Apostles from mingling different subjects in the same discourse, they are determined to remedy the evil, by giving to their works what they consider the right sense, or in other words, by giving to the Scriptures whatsoever sense will best suit their views of Universalism, even if it should attach to Christ and his apostles the charge of error. This, in fact, appears to be the real object of their distinction between the *theocratical and popular sense* of Scripture. Balfour in his 2d section, declares that the Jews in the time of Christ, believed falsely in future punishment; and that our Saviour's language with regard to Lazarus and the rich man, "was only availing himself of their *popular* belief, to shew them the obstinacy of their unbelief." In the next section he informs us that all our Saviour's language concerning Abraham's bosom, and the place of torment in this conspicuous passage "is merely brought in as a part of its imagery," and that, on such subjects, it is not our Saviour's design to adhere "strictly to the truth of things." If by this distinction or any other, Mr. Balfour could prove the Son of God a liar, he would doubtless be congratulated by all the devils in hell, and by many of his brethren on earth. Of the felicitations of one of them at least, he would be absolutely certain. In a pamphlet, entitled "Presbyterianism *versus* Presbyterianism" published by my opponent, in the year 1819, you find him asserting in the 16th page, concerning the plainest historical and doctrinal declarations of Scripture, "all this is *popular*

language, and is true only in a *popular* sense;" that is in a "*false*" sense, as he afterward explains it. By the aid of this distinction, he inculcates that all those passages which are usually perverted to the defence of Unitarianism and Universalism are to be understood in the *theocratical* or *true* sense; and all those which convey most plainly the essential doctrines of Christianity are to be understood in the *popular* or *false* sense. Upon the ground of this distinction, furnished him by Mr, Balfour, he asserts "that God does whatever his creatures do," that God "is not resisted at all;" that "whenever the consequences of the actions of man are beyond his foresight or motive, those consequences cannot be imputed to him, but must be imputed to God alone;" that "man, considered as an instrument in the hands of God, is *altogether* passive." "This system considers man as having nothing to do." "Man, in this sense of speaking, is *altogether* passive, and acts only as he is acted upon." By this plan, my opponent has, in page 16, ascertained the theocratical falsehood of all those passages "in which men are said to go astray like sheep, or to return again to the great Shepherd; to resist the Spirit of God, or to yield obedience to his law; to be lost or to be saved"!!! "It is in the popular [that is the false] sense, only, that men can be subjects of either praise or blame." "In this sense, he is no more accountable than the axe is accountable to the man who useth it, or the saw to the hand which shaketh it."*

After my opponent thinks that he has hewn down all the cedars of Lebanon by this newly invented weapon, he sits down with the self complacency of a certain character who "eateth and wipeth her mouth and saith I have done no wickedness." He even boasts. in his 22d page, that he has done much good. "Thus," says he, "according to this system, being well understood, and *these rules* adhered to in construing the Holy Scriptures, all those contradictions in language, and confusion of ideas, which are so obvious in other systems of divinity, are completely done away." He thinks that by denying the purity of God, the depravity and accountability of man, and the doctrines of perdition and salvation, we are to understand better, that revelation which was given for the express purpose of teaching those very truths which he denies! No wonder that Dr. James P. Wilson, of this city, said, in his printed† animadversions upon

*See pp. 16, 18, 20, 22. † In 1820.

the pamphlet which contains these sentiments, that "the principles of this Universalist appear to be nefarious, beyond a parallel."

But as this way of contradicting the Scriptures by admitting their truth in a *popular sense*, is rather an *unpopular* thing among the churches, some writers have given to this popular or false sense, a more plausible name, by calling it *parabolical*. You would scarcely expect this from Mr. Balfour after his telling us that "a parable, like a fable, is designed to impress on the mind, in a pleasing manner, some *important truth*." He admits that they may be used to establish a "particular *doctrine of christianity*," but prudently remarks that "the utmost caution should be observed in reasoning from them," for this purpose. Yet when he comes to examine a particular case, instead of establishing a "doctrine of christianity," or discovering an "important truth," he takes it for granted that the dialogue between Abraham and the rich man is "*a fiction*," and pretends that thus far we agree with him; and he charges us with inconsistency for believing in opposition to him, that the account of the rich man being in torment is "*a fact*." In the next paragraph he gives this assumed position that the narrative is parabolical as one reason why we should not believe "what is said about *Hades* being a place of torment." In another place, he says concerning the rich man, "But if this is only a *supposed person*, I ask those who may differ from me, to prove that the person is *a real being*. If they advocate *the torment to be a reality*, they ought first to prove *the person tormented in Hades to be* not *a parabolic person*, before they draw the conclusion that the torment is not *a parabolic torment*. The first must be proved before the last can be admitted; for a person must exist before he can be tormented in any place. If the person mentioned is a *real being*, and the torment he complains of *a reality*, and not a *fictitious* or *parabolic representation*. we have a right to demand why every thing in this account is not considered *a narrative of facts*, and not *a parable*."* According to this extract from one of my opponent's favourite authors, *a parable* cannot be *a narrative of facts*; *a parabolic representation* is *a fictitious representation*, and nothing can be truly predicated of *a parabolical person*, because he is only *a supposed person*, and not a *real being*. Is this like impressing "upon the mind, in a pleasing man-

* Section 2d.

ner, some important truth?" This rule was invented to stamp with the seal of *fiction*, every *important truth* which stands in the way of the heretic. By this rule Mr. Ballou, in his first Lecture on the Parables, proved that the axe which "is laid unto the root of the trees," will not even penetrate the outer bark, much less prostrate them in the fire. In his second, he has shewn that there is no danger of the wicked being consumed like chaff in unquenchable fire; and in his third, that they need not fear having their bodies cast into hell as a place of torment. All these passages of Scripture are, in his view, parabolical, and fictitious of course. For the same reason, he and my opponent reject our Saviour's account of the day of judgment, which Mr. Ballou, in the 174th page of his Treatise on Atonement, has styled the "parable of the sheep and goats." He also thinks that he has closed the impassable gulph, not as Curtius did, (for he is probably more like the Jewish rich man, than the Roman hero,) but by pronouncing it a parable, that is, a fiction.

But let us apply the rule as held by these characters, to some familiar cases. Mr. Ballou has not, I believe, told us that the ten commandments were a parable, but he might as well have done it, as to have made a fiction of Luke 16: 18, "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery." This is Mr. Ballou's 37th parable. Of course he must consider the husband and wife *parabolical persons*, and not *real beings*. Then all that is said about marrying, divorcing, and marrying again, is only *a fictitious representation*. Would not this make void the law of God? Besides much doctrinal and practical instruction, we have in the 78th Psalm, a long and strictly *true* history of God's people for many hundred years. But in the second verse, the inspired writer calls it *a parable*. Is it therefore *a fiction*? In the 23d and 24th chapters of Numbers, the Spirit of God foretells the future habitation, increase, prosperity and triumph of his people Israel, and the advent and kingdom of Christ. The inspired writer repeatedly calls these predictions *a parable*. Because Israel is mentioned in a parable, had this people no real existence? Was the star that should come out of Jacob only a "*supposed person*," or an imaginary being? And was his coming a mere *fictitious representation*? But remember that it was not more positively declared that Christ should come, and his people prosper, than that his enemies

should *perish forever*. In the 20th verse of the 24th chapter, the historian says, "and when he looked on Amalek, he took up his parable, and said, Amalek was the first of the nations, but his latter end shall be that he *perish forever*." To deny the truth of these parables could be expected from none but an infidel, and in Proverbs 26: 7, Solomon assures us that no wise man will lame them, by believing a part to be truth and a part fiction. "The legs of the lame are not equal; so is a parable in the mouth of fools."

But we have already observed that another of their rules of exposition is that a scriptural declaration must have a right extent of reference and address. My opponent says,* "the punishment of Gehenna is never threatened to the Gentiles." He denies that Christ "threatened with the punishment of Gehenna, any others than Jews." Mr. Balfour says "that not a word about Hell or Gehenna is said to the Gentiles by any of the inspired writers." He says "that all that is said about Gehenna in the way of threatening or in any other shape was spoken to Jews: Jews and they *only* were the persons addressed when speaking of Gehenna. It is not once named to the Gentiles in all the New Testament, nor are any of them ever threatened with such a punishment."† Their object is to shew that hell does not mean the eternal misery of every unbeliever, but only the temporal calamities of the Jewish nation, in the destruction of Jerusalem. To prove this they state what need not be disputed, that the inspired discourses about Gehenna were *addressed* to Jews only. Their conclusion is, that these discourses *refer* to them only. According to this rule no part of the Bible can relate to Ireland or Philadelphia, because not *addressed* to their inhabitants. Most of the Scriptures were originally addressed to the Jews, yet a great portion of them refer either expressly or implicitly to the Gentiles. Can it be supposed that the poor in spirit, the meek, the mourners, the merciful, the peace-makers, the pure, and the persecuted among the Gentiles, cannot be happy because the beatitudes were addressed to the Jews? Our Saviour once said to certain Jews, "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Because this was not addressed to Gentiles personally, have they therefore no part in either salvation or damnation? Our Saviour intimates that those who are unwilling

* Minutes, p. 177.
† Section 2d and 3d.

to part with an offending hand, or foot, or eye, shall "be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched." Are none but Jews unwilling to forsake their sins? If Gentiles resemble them in character, they must partake of their punishment. Our Saviour says to the Jews, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Are no serpents and vipers to be found among the Gentiles? I should guess that all the hissing which we have had against the truth in this house has not come from Jews. If, then, unbelievers of all nations are the Children of the old serpent, it may be truly said of them, that they cannot escape the damnation of Gehenna. Neither will it avail in proof that Gehenna relates to the destruction of Jerusalem, to say, as Mr. Balfour has done in his 4th section, that John, who wrote after that event, "omits all our Lord's discourses in which it is mentioned;" since he has also omitted the sermon on the Mount and the apostolic commission above quoted, and many other things which relate to Heaven as well as Hell, to salvation as well as perdition.

It has already been announced that the Universalist polemics require that our proofs should be uttered by what they esteem a right number of authors, a right frequency of repetition, and at the right times. My opponent, on this subject, speaks as follows: Paul "never once made use of this term *Gehenna* or *hell* in all his preaching. Ah! Paul, have you preached the whole counsel of God? and yet we cannot find this wonderful term in all your preaching!!! Now my hearers, I ask you, how could Paul preach the whole counsel of God, and yet not preach the *Gehenna* or *hell* of my opponent, if this doctrine of *hell* be contained in any part of the counsel of God?"* Although Mr. Balfour admits that our Saviour threatened unbelieving Jews with the damnation of hell, yet, in his 4th section, he sees no reason even for them to fear, because the Apostles "were commanded to preach the Gospel to every creature," and "they addressed the worst of characters, but to none of them did *they* ever say, *how can ye escape the damnation of hell?*". To prove the same point he tells us in chap. 2. sect. 2, "that the word Gehenna or hell is used by our Lord, and by James, but by no other person in the New Testament." Near the close of Section 4th, he says, "Now let it be supposed, that by this

* Minutes, p. 176.

expression, our Lord meant endless misery in a future state. I ask is it possible our Lord should only mention this once? I ask again, can it be believed, that he who said on the cross, 'Father forgive them, for they know not what they do,' should have ceased, but with his dying breath, to warn these men that such a place of endless misery awaited them? I ask once more, is it possible that he, who, when he beheld the city, 'wept over it,' on account of temporal calamities, in which it was soon to be involved, should shed no tears in anticipating the endless misery of its wicked inhabitants?" From this it would appear that, with such characters, the authority of our Lord, or of an inspired Apostle is not sufficient. They will believe nothing but what has been declared by all the sacred college, very often, on all important occasions, and especially in the hour of death. In the second section of Balfour's first chapter, he leaves "it to any candid man to say, if *Hades* be a place of torment after death, whether our Lord would only mention this once." In the same section of the next chapter, he asks, "how is it to be rationally accounted for, that our Lord *only once* during his whole ministry, should say to the unbelieving Jews, 'how can ye escape the damnation of hell?' if by this he meant future eternal punishment?" The same question might be asked concerning Paradise as a place of happiness, although the *one* time that our Saviour used this word was in his dying hour. Yet it is evident that those who will thus limit the Holy One will not believe when all their arrogant demands are complied with: for his unbelief still continues, although, according to his own acknowledgment,* Gehenna is twice called in Mk. 9th, 'the fire that never shall be quenched.' He observes that "properly speaking, this expression occurs no less than five times; for it is three times said, by way of addition, 'where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." In another place,† he appears to think that twelve repetitions are not sufficient to entitle their authors to credit. His words are the following; viz. "Admitting for the present, that it occurs twelve times, and in all these it is certainly used to express a place of eternal misery, it deserves notice, that this is not so often in the whole Bible, as it is used by many preachers in a single sermon;" and he *might* have added, as Mr. Balfour repeats this miserable subterfuge, in a single chapter.

*Chap. 1, Sect. 3.

† Chap. 1, Sect. 2.

UNIVERSALIST PRACTICE.

Having said thus much of their principles of interpretation, by which they have imposed upon themselves and others, a word or two concerning their practice may not be improper. Although their antagonists may accompany their scripture authorities with elaborate explanations and arguments, they scruple not to accuse them of quoting naked texts, without argument: yet when it suits their purpose, they can glory in perverting detached passages of scripture without explanation. In the 201st page of Mr. Ballou's Treatise on Atonement, he says "Time would fail me, to write one half that might be quoted from the prophets on this subject. I ask for no explanation, on their testimony; if what they say do not prove my doctrine, I will not have recourse to explanations." As he is a professed writer on dark sayings, proverbs and parables, he ought to know what was revealed to Solomon in the introduction to his Proverbs; where we are taught that it is the part of a learned man who has attained to "wise counsels, to understand a proverb, *and the interpretation*, the words of the wise and their dark sayings." My opponent, however, incorrectly attributes to me as a crime, the very thing of which his favourite boasts so vainly; and lest he should not be believed for the want of sufficient repetition he gives it to us often enough. He accuses his antagonist of stating texts "without any argument to prove his interpretation of them correct;" of bringing "text after text without attempting to prove his interpretation of them to be correct by fair argument;" of giving "passage after passage without any argument or explanation;" of giving "a continued series of quotations without any argument to prove the meaning which was attached to them." &c. &c. &c.* These groundless assertions appear intended to reduce his antagonist to a level with a man who repeatedly confesses that he has not wherewith to occupy his sluggish periods.

There is one very remarkable feature in the practice of my opponent. Sometimes he can scarcely converse, preach or print, without a perpetual recurrence to the dead languages. A sermon published by him this year, is quite richly interlarded with Hebrew. In this wonderful production, he tries to give the people some acquaintance with Hebrew radicals. In a note he informs them of the distinction in the

* Minutes pp. 272, 181, 216, 236, 77, 58.

genders of Hebrew nouns; and what must have been very important to those who did not know one letter from another, he informs them that "the reader, must read all Hebrew words from right to left."* He has referred† to debates which he has had in the Commissioner's Hall with laymen and apprentice boys. These men were more remarkable for honesty and good sense than for biblical literature. It is well known that he was in the habit of appealing to the original scriptures with such disputants as could not follow him thither. This he does in letters written to one of these apprentice boys, dated Feb. 14th and March 8th, of the present year. In the latter of these he parades his several Latin versions, the same literary ware, which, like a pedlar with his pins and needles and buttons and combs, he has displayed before this assembly. Having endeavoured in vain to weaken the confidence of his young correspondent in our common version, and to get him to adopt my opponent's new translation, which he ridiculously pretends is a correct translation of Griesbach's Greek Testament, he plainly lets him know in a letter of Feb. 16th, that he must admit Griesbach, of which he knew not one word, or their correspondence should close. "Then" says he, "have I put an end to this discussion."‡ After thus making the sacred originals a *sine qua non* to a discussion with a youth who knew nothing of them, he proposed to me, in the commencement of our dis-

* See his 18mo: Compendium of a Sermon, p. 13. Also, in the 126th page of the Minutes, Mr. Jennings has, in a note, given us a good deal of Greek and Hebrew, accompanied with the following instructions for those, who like, himself, could not read these languages, viz. "The Hebrew words which are written in the Hebrew characters, are read from right to left. These remarks may be of some use to the unlearned, and for them alone they are designed." As it is a notorious fact, and one which has been publicly acknowledged, that Mr. Jennings never read nor wrote a word of Hebrew or Greek in his life, it is easy to see that this note was penned by the same wiseacre who wrote the Compendium of a Sermon. Yet Mr. Jennings begins the note by saying that "the Reporter writes the Hebrew without the points." This is a worthy disciple of a man who expects to teach unlearned readers to pronounce his "Hebrew words which are written in Hebrew characters" by simply telling them that these words "are read from right to left." It would not be a greater evidence of that imbecility to which the understanding is reduced by an overweening pedantry, if he were to expect a land-lubber to navigate a frigate from here to England, by being simply informed that he was to sail from West to East.

† Minutes p. 42.

‡ See "Letters of Correspondence between the Rev. Abner Kneeland and William Justice."

cussion, that we should lay them aside, and abide by our received Translation! !*

REFUTATION.

The exposure now made of my opponent's canons of criticism, and his practice, and that of his brethren, in controverting the truth, may be considered an answer to a great part of what they preach and write on the question between us. Their doctrines remain unsupported, when their principles of interpretation are proved essentially wrong. That cause is always suspected, whose advocates frequently shift their ground; who fill up their time, not by answering their opponent's arguments, but by groundless complaints that he has none; and who make a great flourish of learning among the illiterate, and yet retreat from the light among those who can consult originals. That their cause ought to be suspected and condemned, that their doctrine is without evidence, will appear by a full and fair examination of the arguments advanced by themselves in its defence. With the help of God, this shall be done under the following heads. 1. The present character and sufferings of mankind. 2. The offer of salvation. 3. Arguments for a purgatory. 4. Restitution. 5. The Attributes of God. 6. His fatherly chastisements. 7. The will of God. 8. 9. 10. Christ's Prophetic, Kingly, and Priestly offices.

FIRST UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT.

A writer of some name, against the Universalists, gives the following division of their sources of argument. "1. The universal goodness of God. 2. The universal atonement of Christ. 3. The universal offers of salvation. 4. The univer-

* In the Minutes pp. 256, 272, Mr. K. in opposition to his repeated declarations that I had no argument, acknowledges that there were some argument and some criticism on my part; yet he seems to think it "not necessary" for me "to say any thing more about the meaning of certain Greek words." Before the debate he was so anxious to make *the unlearned* acquainted with *aionion*, *hades*, *gehenna*, *tartarus*, and SHEOL, that he could not wait to teach them the alphabet before he would have them reading from right to left. It is said that some of his followers were in the habit of escaping any argument or text, by crying, "Mr. Kneeland says it is not so in the Greek." At that time, he thought our Bible so imperfect as to need his New Translation and all his other critical labours. How much his mind was changed during the debate, will appear from an account of it which he published a few days after, in which he says scornfully "there was an *aionian* fight about the words αιων, αιωνιος, עולם &c. which was mostly lost to the audience, and which ended nearly where it commenced." He says moreover, "No rational man can believe any thing essential to salvation which is not *plainly* and *clearly* revealed, and which depends on something better than such equivocal terms for its support."

al goodness of mankind. 5. Their universal punishment in this life." His two last divisions I make my first; because they are the weakest and the least relied upon by their advocates. A single case is not now recollected in which they have urged them at all; and if they were to insist that all men are good, we could only say with the Spirit, "there is none good;" and the same Spirit declares that some sins shall not be forgiven; "neither in this world, neither in the world to come:" so that punishment in this world, whether partial or universal, does not preclude a future punishment.

SECOND UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT.

The argument drawn from the offer of salvation cannot be more fairly treated than by admitting that salvation is offered to all who hear the gospel, and are willing to be saved in God's appointed way. But the *mere invitation* to the supper mentioned in Luke 14th, did not avail those who made excuses, and concerning whom it was said, "that none of those which were bidden shall taste of my supper."

THIRD UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT.

As it is a fact that many Universalists advocate a sort of purgatory, a concise notice will be taken of those texts which are erroneously thought to countenance that doctrine.

1. Isa. 4: 4. "When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have *purged* the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof by the spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning." This is explained in Isa. 31: 9. 48: 10, where it is declared that the Lord's "fire is in Zion and his furnace in Jerusalem;" and that his people are *chosen*, or as some copies have it, they are *tried*, "in the furnace of affliction."

2. Zech. 9: 11. "As for thee also, by the blood of thy Covenant, I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water." Concerning a temporal captivity, Isa. 51: 14, uses the following similar language. "The captive exile hasteneth that he may be loosed, and that he should not die in the pit, nor that his bread should fail." The Israelites owed to the blood of the Great Covenant Sacrifice, their deliverance from Egypt and Babylon a well as their preservation from Tophet.

3. 1 Cor. 3: 13-15. "Every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abideth, which he hath

built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." The following are verses 9, 12. "For we are labourers together with God. Ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building. Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble." Here the officers of the church are said to build it up of good and bad members. When the building is assailed by the fire of persecution, the wood, hay, and stubble are consumed; that is, hypocrites apostatize, while the faithful pastor and the sound members, the gold, silver, and precious stones, endure the flame, and shall be saved or refined and preserved, yet so as by or through the fire.

4. 1 Pet. 3: 9, "By whom," (that is, the Spirit, see verse 18,) "By whom also he went and preached unto the Spirits in prison." That these spirits were in hell at the time of the Apostle's writing is agreed. But that they were in prison when the Spirit of a long-suffering God preached salvation to them, is disputed on the authority of the next verse, which confines the long-suffering of God in respect of them, to the days of Noah, and confines the salvation of God to the few, that is to the eight souls which were in the ark, Verse 20, "which [spirits now in prison] sometime [that is long ago] were disobedient, when once [that is long ago] the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls were saved by water." If salvation was preached to them in hell or after their death, why should the long-suffering of God be thus restricted in their case, to "the days of Noah while the ark was a preparing?"

FOURTH UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT.

Mr. Ballou,* in shewing "that all will be brought, finally, to the enjoyment of spiritual life and peace," says, "There is a passage in Acts 3: 20, 21, which reads very literally in proof of my argument. 'And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you, whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." As the word *apokatastasis*† here rendered *restitution*, occurs only once in the New Testament, and not once in the Septuagint, there may appear great room for fanciful and erroneous interpretations. Yet in the 70 of

* Treatise on Atonement, p. 193. † ἀποκατάστασις

Amos 5: 15, we find a conjugate used in connection with the judgment of civil courts on earth, in exactly the same meaning which the word has in Acts 3: 21, in relation to the judgment of the last day. The prophet says, "Hate evil and love good, KAI APOKATASTESETE EN PULAIS KRIMA;† *and establish judgment in the gates.*" In Acts 1: 11, it is said that Christ "shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." In the passage in question, it is said that the Lord shall send him; and that this sending and coming shall be at the period of the *restitution*, or *constitution*, or *establishment*, or *settlement*, or *consummation* of all things. In 1 Cor. 15: 24, 25, we find that one feature of this important settlement is the restitution of "the kingdom to God, even the Father;" and another is, shall we say a restitution of all enemies to the bosom of the Redeemer? No; but at that period, he shall have "put all enemies under his feet;" "and these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." It is true that Mr. Ballou and my opponent who quote this prophecy of Peter concerning the restitution of all things, deny that a general judgment shall ever take place. But the same Apostle* has predicted this denial also, when he says "that there shall come in the last days, scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, where is the promise of *his coming!*"

FIFTH UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT.

As it is believed that God's holiness, justice and truth require the eternal punishment of incorrigible offenders, and that the scriptures limit the application of his love, mercy, and grace accordingly, the consideration of these attributes shall be postponed to my first argument in favour of future punishment. We shall in the mean time attend to what is urged from God's fore-knowledge, his immutability, and his being the God of universal creation and providence. Although Winchester‡ thinks that the argument from God's universal providence "has weight in it," and professes to give the authority of—1st, the American Indians, and 2dly, the Apostle Paul, in support of it; yet he says, "this I do not insist upon." It is hoped, therefore, that I shall be excused from insisting upon a sophism which can as well refute the doctrine of present suffering, as of eternal punishment. As he supports the argument from the universal creation only by a perversion of

* 2 Pet. 3; 3, 4. † [illegible]
‡ His Universal Restoration, dialogue 4th.

Isa. 57: 16, which is a promise to the church of Christ, that passage may be attended to among others of the same description, under the 9th argument, to which it properly belongs.

In Mr. Winchester's 4th dialogue, he professes to display the strong holds of Universalism. 1. God is the universal and only creator of all. 2. The universal benevolence of the Deity, or love of God to his creatures. 3. Christ died for all. 4. The unchangeableness of God. 5. The immutability of God's counsels. 6. God hath given all things into the hand of Christ. 7. The scriptures must be fulfilled; the scriptures cannot be broken.*

The 3d of these arguments will be my last. The 6th, the one before the last. The 1st and 2d have been already postponed. The texts under his 5th head shall be generally considered under my 7th and 9th. To his 4th, 5th, and 7th, it may now be briefly answered that because we believe in the truth of God's word, and the immutability of the counsels of an ununchangeable God, therefore we declare that the wicked "shall go into *everlasting* punishment, and the righteous into *everlasting* life:" for this is declared by that God whose nature and counsels cannot change, and by those scriptures which "cannot be broken."

The argument from the fore-knowledge of God has, notwithstanding its daring impiety, been urged very much, to my own knowledge, even by the followers of Winchester, who are generally esteemed the better sort of Universalists, and sometimes appear to be almost christians. Mr. Ballou declares that if "the Almighty" knew "before he made man" "that he would deserve an endless punishment," "*it proves that an infinite cruelty existed in God!!*" The only reason why this profane language is repeated, is that it has been taken for solid argument, by some who did not consider that if it be cruel to fore-know eternal punishment, it must be cruel, only in a less degree, to fore-know temporal suffering, without preventing it. "Man is born to trouble as the sparks fly upward." The God of providence foresees all his temporal sins and sorrows,† and the God of judgment fore-knows all his eternal sins and sufferings:‡ yet this does not attach an infinite degree, no the least degree of cruelty to the immaculate character of Jehovah: and that blasphemer who can say that it does, needs

* Did Mr. Jennings, in the 22d page of his Report, give me this last argument, to make me talk as childishly as Mr. Winchester?

† 2 Kings, 8; 12 13.

‡ Matt. 25; 41, 46.

not a mark in his forehead to convince all tender christians that he is an enemy to revealed religion.

SIXTH UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT.

Fatherly Chastisements. My opponent has quoted the following passages. Job. 5: 17. "Behold! happy is the man whom God correcteth, therefore despise not the chastening of the Almighty." Prov. 3: 12. "For whom the Lord loveth he correcteth, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth."* My opponent observes,† "although the Father of all mercies has said [Ps. 89: 32, 33,] that he will visit the transgressions of his children 'with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes,' he adds, 'nevertheless, my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail.' And again, Hebr. 12: 9—11, 'Furthermore, we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence; shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of our spirits, and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present, seemeth to be joyous but grievous; nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby." The inference which my opponent would have us draw from these and similar passages is, that none can be punished forever, because this would be to their inexpressible injury; whereas in these texts, God is represented as viewing all mankind in the light of children, and as correcting them in loving kindness, that they may be profited by a growth in holiness, righteousness and happiness.

But in each of the chapters from which the above texts are taken, there is evidence that these things are said of the pious and not of all mankind. In Job 5: 12—14, we find that he who corrects his children for their good, also "taketh the wise in their own craftiness; and the counsel of the froward is carried headlong." In Prov. 3: 32—35, we find that "the froward is abomination to the Lord;" "the curse of the Lord is in the house of the wicked;" "he scorneth the scorners;" "shame shall be the promotion of fools:" and in other passages of scripture, this shame is said to be "a perpetual shame," and an "everlasting confusion."‡ In the 88th

* Minutes, p. 140.

† Minutes, p. 180.

‡ Jer. 20; 11. 23; 40.

Psalm* we are taught that God's children whom he corrects are those who know the joyful sound of justice and judgment, mercy and truth; who walk in the light of his countenance; who rejoice in his name all the day; and are exalted in his righteousness, and not their own: that is, they are persons who are justified, adopted and sanctified through grace. Concerning others he says in verse 10th, "thou hast scattered thine enemies with thy strong arm." Hebrews 12: 8, tells us that these enemies are not children but bastards, and are therefore let alone, as Ephraim was when joined to his idols. Verses 5th and 7th imply, as many other scriptures plainly declare, that these bastards do not endure the chastening of the Lord either with reverence or fortitude, but first despise it and then faint under it; whereas his children are supported under it, and profited by it.

SEVENTH UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT.

The will of God. As we are now entering upon the strong holds of Universalism, in which time and labour must be spent to present their system in the most advantageous light, let it be remarked that when, in the name of the adversary, the orthodox are charged with denying scripture, it is not to be understood that the charge is admitted on our part: neither are the Universalists to be understood as making this confession, when, either now or hereafter, I lay such errors at their door. With this explanation, it may be said that the orthodox limit to a part of mankind, that "good will towards men" which the angels, at the birth of Christ, proclaimed to belong "to all people."† Orthodoxy says that God wills the death of the sinner; but in Ez. 33: 11. 18: 23. 32, "I have no *pleasure* in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God, wherefore turn yourselves and live ye." The scriptures say in 2 Pet. 3: 9. "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness, but is long suffering to us ward, not *willing* that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." Does not Orthodoxy say, that he is willing that many should be lost without repentance? The Bible assures us in 1 Tim. 2: 4, that God "*will* have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth:" Whereas Orthodoxy says that he *will* have only some men to be saved, and the rest to perish without knowledge. In vain will they endeavour to escape the force of these declarations by distin-

* See verses 14—16, 23—36.
† Luke 2: 10, 14.

guishing between God's secret and revealed will, for he does not contradict himself and speak deceitfully: and as to their admission that it is his will of precept only, and not his will of purpose that all men should be saved, is not this in direct opposition to his own word, in Eph. 1: 9—11, where it is said that he hath "made known unto us his *will*, according to his *good pleasure* which he hath *purposed* in himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in Heaven, and which are on Earth, even in him; in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being *predestinated* according to the *purpose* of him who worketh all things after the *counsel* of his own *will*." Here God is said to gather together in one all things in Christ. Does not this mean that he will save all men? But this is said to be according to his *will*; "according to his good *pleasure* which he hath *purposed* in himself;" according to his *purpose* of *predestination*, and the *counsel* of his own *will*."* On these grounds we† confidently argue that God's will of purpose is always accomplished;—that it is his *will of purpose* that all men, universally shall be saved;—and that therefore, all men universally shall be saved.

The texts already adduced are given in proof that it is God's will of purpose that all men universally shall be saved. The only difficulty therefore which can remain is, to prove that his will of purpose is always accomplished. But this is acknowledged by the standards of the Orthodox, and the above passage from Ephesians which says that God "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will" is produced by the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, Chapter 3, Section 5, to prove it. To support the 1st Section of the same Chapter they have quoted Romans 9: 15, 18, also, which is much to our purpose. "I will have mercy on whom I *will* have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I *will* have compassion." "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he *will* have mercy." Speaking of God's creatures, the 2nd section of the 2nd chapter declares that he "hath most sovereign dominion over them, to do by them, for them, and upon them, whatsoever himself pleaseth." In support of this most certain truth, they quote Dan. 4: 25, 35. "The Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he *will*; and all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing; and he

* For John 6: 39, see argument 9th, to which it belongs in common with the seventh.

† The Universalists.

doeth according to his *will* in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, what doest thou?" God says, in Isa. 46: 10, "My *counsel* shall stand, and I will do all my *pleasure*." God's will of purpose is the desire of his heart, the determination of his divine mind. It is sovereign and immutable and cannot be thwarted. Job, 23: 13, "He is in one mind, and who can turn him? and what his soul desireth, even that he doeth."

In answering the above argument, the Orthodox need not oppose the sovereignty of God. Most conscientiously do I agree with the Bible and the Confession of Faith, that his will of purpose is always accomplished. But although my opponent at this moment, professes the same doctrine, to serve a turn, he has in other stages of the debate, filled up his wearisome minutes by holding it up to the derision of the audience. Neither shall I explain the above texts by saying, as Mr. Ballou has attributed to us,* that they are "expressive of God's *revealed* will, but not of his *secret* will; arguing that his revealed will is in direct opposition to a will which he has seen fit not to reveal." His revealed word, though not a full developement of his secret will, is nevertheless perfectly consistent with it. Yet as his commands are often broken, and thus his mandatory will not always fulfilled, it is called his will of *precept* to distinguish it from his will of *purpose* which is ever fulfilled. For this distinction we have plain authority in many scriptures where there is a certain *will* of God which is expressly declared not to be done. Luke 12: 47. "And that servant which knew his Lord's *will* and prepared not himself, neither did according to his *will*." Matt. 21: 31. "Whether of them twain did the *will* of his father? They say unto him the first." It is plainly implied that the second did not. Now that *will* of God which this second son did not perform, and which the above mentioned servant did not perform, cannot be the desire of his heart, or the determination of his soul, or his *will of purpose*, because this is always performed: but it must be his law, or his commandments of whatsoever description, which we therefore call his will of *precept* and which, though like their author, holy, just and good, are often disregarded. It is to this that our Saviour must have referred when, in weeping over Jerusalem, he said "how oft did I *will*," (as it is literally rendered,) "how oft did I *will* to

* On Atonement p. 202.

gather thy children together as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye *would* not!" Because of their "*would not*," his *precepts* were disregarded, while his divine *purposes* were accomplished in their just destruction. So it is with regard to most of the texts quoted concerning the *will* of God for the salvation of all. In Ez. 18: 32, God took no *pleasure* in the death of him that dieth; yet he did die, as every persevering unbeliever must forever. In the next authority quoted, the Apostle Peter tells us* that "the Lord is not *willing* that any should perish." If this were his *will of purpose*, none would ever perish: yet the same Apostle tells us in the same epistle† that some, "as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not, and shall utterly *perish* in their own corruption." The Apostle Paul tells us‡ that "the preaching of the cross is to them that *perish* foolishness." But Peter tells us moreover that it is God's will "that all should come to repentence." If this be the desire of his heart, then all must and will *repent*: but if it be only his *will of precept*, some may violate this will, and remain impenitent. That this is the fact, Paul teaches;¶ "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened" "if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto *repentance*." Therefore this will of God that they should repent, must be his *command*. This is so evidently the meaning of such passages, that M'Knight, who is generally very cautious in admitting any important truth, manifests on this subject an unusual degree of candour and even gives the word *command* instead of *will* in his translation of 1 Tim. 2: 4. "Who *commandeth* all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." If it were not his *precept* but the determination of his soul, all men would be saved, and all would come to the knowledge of the truth. But God says, in Hosea 4: 6, "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge;" and in John 5: 29, "they shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." Since, therefore, some are damned and not saved; since some are destroyed for lack of knowledge instead of coming to the knowledge of the truth, God's will on this subject must be that of *precept* and not of *purpose*. The same doctrine is established by Rom. 9: 15, 18,

* 2 Peter 3: 9.
† 2 Pet. 2: 12.
‡ 1 Cor. 1: 18.
¶ Heb. 6: 4—6.

quoted against us, let the will of God in that passage be understood as it may. After saying that God hath "mercy on whom he will have mercy," the Apostle adds by way of contrast, "and whom he will, he hardeneth."

The only remaining text advanced against us under this head of argument, is Eph. 1: 9—11, where it is said, "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him." This gathering of all things in Christ, is acknowledged to be according to God's *will of purpose*, as asserted by my opponent, and proved by the verses immediately preceding and following the 10th just now quoted. On this subject there is no dispute, and my opponent might have saved himself much unnecessary labour* by passing it over as a thing admitted by both parties. The only question is, what is meant by this gathering of all things in Christ which is to take place in the dispensation of the fulness of times? My opponent has identified it with "the times of restitution of all things,"† already explained in our 5th Universalist argument. If this be correct, and I believe it is, then this gathering of all things in Christ is that restoring, constituting, establishing, or settling of all things, which shall take place at the general judgment, when there shall be a restoring of "the kingdom to God, even the Father," and when he shall "put all enemies under his feet." Not only is the innumerable multitude of the redeemed called "all things," by the Apostle, but in this same chapter, he speaks of these enemies upon whom he tramples, by the same general description of "all things." Verses 22. 23. "And hath put *all things* under his feet, and gave him to be the Head over *all things* to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Here are two very different classes of mankind, and each of them is called "all things." The first "all things" which our heavenly conqueror puts under his feet, we are informed by the same Apostle in 1 Cor. 15: 25, constitutes the body of his *enemies*. The second "all things" constitutes "the church which is his body;" "for we are members of his body, of his flesh and his bones," as the same epistle declares.‡ Now although we read of Christ gathering the members of the church invisible into his arms as the shepherd does the lambs,

* Minutes, pp. 292, 293.
† Minutes p. 293.
‡ 5: 30.

and of his placing them, in the great day of restitution, on his right hand, as sheep, we never once read of his putting them under his feet. The scriptures expressly inform us that this treatment is given to *enemies*, both by God and man.

The amount of this authority which has been cited against us, when taken with its context, appears to be this; that it is God's will of purpose that when the trump of judgment shall sound, Christ's mystical body which was before divided, a part being in heaven and a part on the earth, shall be gathered in one, and that those who have not obtained that predestinated inheritance, mentioned in the 11th verse, shall according to the 22nd, be put under his feet. The argument then, from that class of texts which relates to the will of God, instead of proving Universal Salvation, proves only that the invisible church, the body of believers, shall be saved, while the synagogue of Satan, the enemies of the Divine Redeemer, shall be lost forever. The Apostle's saying, as in the 10th verse, that God will gather "all things" in Christ, is no better evidence for universal salvation, than his saying, as in verse 22nd, that he shall put "all things" under his feet, is proof of universal damnation. But as the scriptures are consistent and not contradictory, we may and ought to explain this to mean, as the Bible uniformly declares, that he that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.

EIGHTH UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT.

Christ's Prophetic Office.—When he speaks to his followers of *his* being with them, he says, in John 12: 35, "the light is with you;" that is, with the Jews: but in Acts 26: 18, he sends Paul to the Gentiles, "to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light." In Luke 1: 79, he is said "to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death;" and in Luke 2: 32, he is called "a light to lighten thy Gentiles and the glory of thy people Israel." Neither does this light shine in vain, but it dispels the darkness, and illuminates the world universally.* It is said, in 1 John, 2: 8, "the darkness is past, and the true light now shineth." In Ephes. 1: 8, it is written, "ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord." On this subject Mr. Ballou† quotes Isa. 49: 6. "And he said, it is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes

* Say the Universalists.
† On Atonement, p. 200.

o Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my *salvation* unto the ends of the earth." To the same amount, Mr. Murray repeatedly* quotes Habb. 2: 14, "For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God, as the waters cover the sea." But none appears more pointed than John 1: 9, "That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."† Compare this with the 4th verse, and you will see that this is a quickening, saving light. "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." In the text just quoted from Isaiah, this light is identified with *salvation*. In Acts 26: 18, we are taught that turning them from darkness to light, is the same as turning "them from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified." Now let it be observed that in consequence of this saving light, the above authorities prove that "the darkness is past," that those who "were sometimes darkness," are now "light in the Lord;" that "the earth shall be filled with" this light, even "unto the ends of the earth;" embracing Jews and Gentiles, even "every man that cometh into the world." The amount of the evidence is this;—Christ saves all whom he enlightens;—but he enlightens all universally;—Therefore all universally shall be saved.

A great portion of the plausibility of the above argument is owing to the texts being detached from their connection. Examine them as they are found in the Bible, and the illusion vanishes. It will then appear that the minor proposition of the above syllogism is unsupported in scripture. It is hardly necessary to mention that a more correct translation, probably, of John 1: 19 is "That was the true light, which coming into the world, enlighteneth every man." Certain it is, that his coming into the world is recognized in all the passages quoted, as the occasion of this extraordinary diffusion of light. Its being extraordinary at his advent, is itself a denial of its antecedent universality. At his coming, it is said "the darkness is past," but before he came "to turn them from darkness to light," the nations had sat for four thousand years "in darkness and the shadow of death;" and in this moral darkness, many millions had passed, without hope or comfort, "through the dark valley and shadow of

* Universalism Vindicated, pp. 49, 73.

† John 6; 45, is not here noticed, because it was more convenient to give in the 9th argument the force of the word *all* on which the Universalist cause hangs.

death." When he told his followers, "The light is with you," as in the first text quoted in their favour, he let them know, that, as it had lately come, it would soon disappear, unless they profited by it. "Then Jesus said unto them, yet "a little while *is the light with you*: walk while ye have "the light, *lest darkness come* upon you: for he that walketh "in darkness, knoweth not whither he goeth. *While ye have* "the light *believe* in the light, that ye may be *children* of "light."* From this it would appear that even after the light has come, men are liable to walk in darkness and be children of darkness; and that this will be their character; unless they *believe in the light*. In the second authority quoted in their favour,† Christ promises "to open their eyes, and to "turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of "Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, "and an inheritance among them which are *sanctified by* "*faith that is in me*." These last words deny the universality of this light, unless it can be shewn that all men living, or at least, all men dying, are *sanctified by faith* in Christ. The same is taught in the context of the passage from John,‡ "But as many as *received* him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that *believe* on his name which are *born*, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but *of God*." But did they all believe on him? Did they all receive him? The context says,§ "the light shineth in darkness, and the darknes comprehended it not." "He came unto his own, and his own received him not." Are those persons enlightened who hate their brother,¶ or who refuse to receive Christ and his Gospel? "To the law and to the tes- "timony: if they speak not according to this word, it is be- "cause there is *no light* in them."** "In that day shall the deaf hear the words of the *Book* [precious book!] and the "eyes of the blind shall see out of obscurity, and out of dark- "ness."†† But this same prophet Isaiah,‡‡ pronounces a *woe* upon some in his day, who, like my opponent, took "darkness for light, and light for darkness." To such our Saviour says,§§ "if therefore, the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" This rejection of the

* John 12; 35, 36.
† Acts 26; 18.
‡ John 1; 12, 13.
§ Verses 5, 11.
¶ 1 John 2; 9.
** Isa. 8; 20.
†† Isa. 29; 18.
‡‡ Isa. 5; 20.
§§ Matt. 6; 23.

light, and evil-eyed perversion of the truth, he declares to be a subject of just condemnation, and a proper cause of eternal punishment. "And this is the condemnation, that light "is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than "light, because their deeds were evil."* "Then said the "King to the servant, bind him hand and foot, and take "him away, and cast him into *outer darkness*; there shall "be weeping and gnashing of teeth."† "Raging waves of the "sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to "whom is reserved *the blackness of darkness forever*."‡ If all men universally are savingly enlightened, how comes it that some "are in darkness, even until now?"§ that some have "no light in them?" that there are some who take darkness for light? some whose very light is darkness, and *great darkness*? How comes it that there are some whose *condemnation* is, that they have "loved darkness rather than light?" and whose punishment is, that they are to be cast "into outer darkness," and into "the blackness of darkness FOREVER?"

NINTH UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT.

Christ's Kingly Office.—Do not the Scriptures represent Christ as destroying the works of the Devil, and trampling all evil under his feet? "For this purpose, the Son of God "was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the "Devil."¶ "He hath put *all enemies under his feet.* The "last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath "put *all things under his feet*." "Behold I shew you a mys-"tery: we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: "for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised "incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corrupti-"ble must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on "immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on in-"corruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, "then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death "is swallowed up in victory. Oh death! where is thy sting? O "grave! where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin, and "the strength of sin is the law; but thanks be to God, who "giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."**

* John 3; 19.
† Matt. 22; 13.
‡ Jude 13.
§ 1 John, 2; 9.
¶ 1 John, 3; 8.
** 1 Cor. 15; 25—27. 51—57.

"Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy "hands; thou hast put *all things under his feet.*"* "Thou "hast put *all things in subjection under his feet.* For in that "he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is "not put under him. But now we see not yet all things "put under him."

While he thus wages a war of extermination against sin of which he is not the author, does he not cease to contend with the souls which he *has* made? Mr. Winchester's text on the universality of God's creation, postponed from my fifth Universalist argument to this place, says, "For I will "not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth; for "the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made."† To this he might have added Ps. 86: 9, "*All nations whom thou hast made* shall come and worship before thee." Although he will not contend forever, he says‡ "I have loved thee with an everlasting love." As there is no end to his love, so "of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end."§ "In his days shall the "righteous flourish, and abundance of peace as long as the "moon endureth. He shall have dominion also from sea to "sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. They "that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him, and his "enemies shall lick the dust." "All kings shall fall be-"fore him, all nations shall serve him." "He shall re-"deem their soul from deceit and violence, and precious "shall be their blood in his sight." "Men shall be blessed "in him: all nations shall call him blessed."¶

Are not the unlimited extent and the happy results of the Saviour's dominion plainly revealed in Rom. 8: 19—24? "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the "manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was "made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of "him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the "creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of "corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and tra-"vaileth in pain together until now. And not only they "but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, "even we ourselves, groan within ourselves, waiting for "the adoption to wit, the redemption of our body. For we "are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope: for

* Ps. 8; 6.
† Is. 57; 16. ‡ Jer. 31; 3. § Is. 9. 7. ¶ Ps. 72; 7—9. 11. 15. 17.

"what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?" On the same subject, is it not sung by the myriads on high, "And "every creature which is in Heaven, and on the earth, and "such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I "saying, blessing and honour, and glory and power, be un-"to him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb "forever and ever.*

In Hebr. 1: 2. he is declared to be "Heir of all things." "I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance."† He himself declares "all things are delivered unto me of my Father." "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all "things into his hands." "Thou hast given him power "over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many "as thou hast given him." "And this is the Father's will "which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, "I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the "last day."‡

According to the tenor of this universal transfer to Christ, it is written, "All the ends of the earth shall remember and "turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations "shall worship before thee. For the kingdom is the Lord's, "and he is the Governor among the nations. All they that "be fat upon earth shall eat and worship: all they that "go down to the dust shall bow before him, and none can "keep alive his own soul."¶ "And there was given him "dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, na-"tions, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an "everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his "kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."** "Look un-"to me and be ye saved, *all the ends of the earth*; †† for I "am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, "the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and "shall not return, that unto me *every knee* shall bow, *every* "*tongue* shall swear. Surely shall one say, in the Lord have "I righteousness and strength: even to him shall men come; "and *all* that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. "In the Lord shall *all* the seed of Israel be justified, and "shall glory."‡‡ "Wherefore God also hath highly exalt-"ed him, and given him a name which is above *every* name:

*Rev. 5; 13.
† Ps. 2; 8.
‡ Matt. 11; 27. Luke 10; 22. John 3; 35. 13; 3. 17; 2. 6; 39.
¶Ps. 22; 27—29.
** Dan. 7; 14.
†† See Argument 2d.
‡‡Isa. 45; 23—25.

"that at the name of Jesus, *every knee* should bow, of things "in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, "and that *every tongue* should confess that Jesus Christ is "Lord, to the glory of God the Father."* "For the Father "judgeth *no man*, but hath committed all judgment unto the "Son; that *all men* should honour the Son, even as they "honour the Father."†

It is expressly declared that "God sent not his Son into "the world, to condemn the world, but that the world through "him might be saved." "I came not to judge the world, "but to save the world."‡ "But Israel shall be saved in "the Lord with an everlasting salvation: ye shall not be "ashamed nor confounded world without end."¶ "No wea-"pon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every "tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt "condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, "and their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord."**

Although the number and aggravation of their offences may increase their necessities, can they hinder the mercy of God? "They that be whole need not a physician, but they "that are sick. But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I "will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to "call the righteous, but sinners to repentance."†† "This is "a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ "Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am "chief." "Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecuter, "and injurious; but I obtained mercy, because I did it igno-"rantly in unbelief."k "Come now, and let us reason to-"gether, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they "shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, "they shall be as wool."

In fact, the end of Christ's coming, and of the preaching of his gospel is to deliver men from sin and sorrow. "And thou "shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from "their sins."x "For the law of the spirit of life in Christ "Jesus, hath made me free from the law of sin and death."z "The Lord hath sent me to preach good tidings unto the meek; "he hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim "liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them "that are bound."q "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty

* Phil. 2. 9—11.
‡ John 3; 17. 12; 47.
** Isa. 54; 17.
k 1 Tim. 1. 15, 13.
z Rom. 8. 2.
† John 5; 22, 23.
¶ Isa. 45; 17.
†† Matt. 9. 12, 13.
x Matt. 1. 21.
q Isa. 61. 1.

"wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled "again with the yoke of bondage."*

All being thus relieved from sin, they are from misery also. "And in this mountain shall the Lord of Hosts make unto "*all people* a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of "fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. "And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the cov-"ering cast over *all people*, and the vail that is spread over "*all nations*. He will swallow up death in victory; and the "Lord God will wipe away tears from off *all faces*; and the "rebuke of his people shall be taken away from off *all the* "*earth*; for the Lord hath spoken it."† "And God shall "wipe away *all tears* from their eyes; and there shall be no "more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall their "be *any more pain*: for the former things are past away."‡

To the foregoing authorities which one would suppose universal enough, we add the following; which, as well as those already recited, are found scattered among the rubbish of my opponent and other Universalist authors, some in one and some in another, but in none of them brought to a focus, and presented in that perfection of perversion of which they are susceptible.

Our Saviour, in prospect of his crucifixion, says "And I, if "I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me."¶ The Patriarch Jacob said, "unto him shall the gathering of "the people be."** "That he might gather together in one "all things in Christ."†† "Who shall *change* our vile body, "that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, accord-"ing to the working whereby he is able even to *subdue all* "*things* unto himself."‡‡ "For it pleased the Father that in "him should all fulness dwell. And (having made peace "through the blood of his cross,) by him to *reconcile all things* "to himself; by him, I say, whether they be *things in earth* "or *things in heaven*."§ "Thus saith the Lord God; I will "also take of the highest branch of the high cedar, and will "set it; I will crop off from the top of his young twigs a ten-"der one, and will plant it upon an high mountain and emi-"nent: in the mountain of the height of Israel will I plant it: "and it shall bring forth boughs, and bear fruit, and be a "goodly cedar; and *under it shall dwell all fowl of every wing*; "*in the shadow* of the branches thereof shall they dwell. And

* Gal. 5. 1.
† Isa. 25. 6—8.
‡ Rev. 21. 4.
¶ John 12. 32.
** Gen. 49. 10.
†† Eph. 1. 10.
‡‡ Phil. 3. 21.
§ Coll. 1. 19, 20.

"*all the trees of the field* shall know that I the Lord have "brought down the high tree, have dried up the green tree, "and have made the dry tree to flourish."* "He that des-"cended is the same also that ascended up far above all "heavens, that he might *fill all things*."† "For God hath "concluded them all in unbelief, that he might *have mercy* "*upon all*."‡ "And the scripture foreseeing that God would "*justify* the heathen through faith, preached before the gos-"pel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall *all nations be bles-*"*sed*." "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises "made. He saith not and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, "and to thy seed, which is Christ."§ "And I will bless "them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and "in thee *shall all families of the earth be blessed*." "And in "thy seed shall *all the nations of the earth be blessed*, because "thou hast obeyed my voice."**

Thus we†† see that Christ came to destroy the works of the devil, so that death itself shall be swallowed up in victory. He came to put all evil under his feet. He came not to condemn the world but to save it; not to call the righteous but sinners, even the chief of sinners. He came to put an end to sins, and their consequent sorrows. He came to show mercy to all; to draw, gather, and subdue all; to change,‡‡ reconcile, and protect all; to fill, justify and bless all. There shall be no end to the increase of his government. He delivers the *whole creation* from corruption. *Every creature* in heaven and in the earth, and under the earth, *all* the ends of the earth, *all* kindreds of mankind, *all* fowls of every wing, *all* the trees of the field, *all* people, nations, languages, and tongues shall confess and praise, worship, bow, and kneel before him, and honor him as they honour the Father. He will cease to contend *forever*, but will exercise an *everlasting* love; so that men shall not be ashamed nor confounded *world without end*. He bestows righteousness and strength, glory and salvation, on all followers, servants, or children whom he claims, and whom the Father has given him;——But the Father has given him, and he claims for his followers, all men universally;——Therefore all men universally shall be saved.

In answer to the argument just given, it may be observed that the major proposition of the syllogism with which it

* Ez. 17. 22—24.
† Eph. 4. 70.
‡ Rom. 11. 32.
§ Gal. 3. 8, 16.
** Gen. 12. 3, 22. 18.
†† The Universalists.
‡‡ This changing relates to the bodies of God's people.

closes, is so entirely acceptable to the most rigidly Orthodox, that it has the appearance of being manufactured to suit their taste. This is a mistake. My opponent often declares that Christ came not to save men in their sins, but from their sins; they must therefore be followers, servants and children: and Mr. Ballou actually quotes at large,* the passage from Isaiah given in the foregoing argument, in which it is written, "surely shall one say, in the Lord have I righteousness and "strength." "In the Lord shall all the *seed* of Israel be "*justified* and shall glory."

Equal justice is done to them in the statement of the minor proposition, about which we differ. In order for them to support this, and thus legitimate the conclusion, it will not suffice for them to prove that Christ is King of nations or the King of the universe; this is admitted: but they must prove that all men universally are his willing subjects, his worthy followers. If, instead of this, it should be found that some of their authorities only prove Christ's universal dominion over friends and foes, saved and lost; and that others prove only a part of mankind, such as those who have their righteousness and strength in the Lord, to be given to him and claimed by him as his followers, the conclusion falls.

There is much stress laid upon Rom. 8: 19—24, in which the word *creature* or *creation*† (an extensive word) is used four times. It is said that this *whole creation* was involuntarily subjected to vanity, and that it "groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now:" but that, "in hope," it "waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God;" and "shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God." It is here declared that the *whole creation* sympathizes with man in the corruption, toil and pain consequent upon the fall, and shall participate with the children of God in their glorious emancipation. As the whole human race fell in Adam, and as the Universalists say that the whole human race shall be children of God, therefore they say that the whole creation here means the whole human race universally, and exclusive of every other sort of creature. Their system depends upon this unauthorized interpretation. So far from its being used for all *men* to the exclusion of the inferior creation, in the only two instances, in which it occurs in the Septuagint,‡ it means irrational creatures to the exclusion of the human race. That the Apostle Paul did not

* On Atonement p. 214.
† κτισις
‡ 2 Chr. 14. 15. Ezr. 3. 21.

intend it as synonimous with *the children of God* is evident from the express distinction which he makes between *them* and the whole creation, in the passage under consideration. After telling us in the 22d verse, that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth, he says in the 23d, "*and not only they, but ourselves also*, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves." That he did not use *the whole creation* to embrace every child of Adam, is plain from Col. 1: 23; where he declares that even in his day, the gospel "was preached in the whole creation."§ In this place, and in Romans 8th, it appears to signify *the whole earth*: that earth which, according to Gen. 3: 17, participated in the curse pronounced upon fallen man; that earth, which, with all its irrational appendages animate and inanimate, yet groans and travails in pain under the abuse which men have made of it; that earth which is destined to be delivered from this abuse, and to rejoice, with its hills and forests* herds and flocks, in the liberty of the children of God.

Long before this deliverance, it is said, in Rev. 5: 13, that "every creature which is in Heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea. and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing and honour and glory and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." By examining the context it will be seen that this took place before the opening of the Apocalyptic seals; that is, many hundreds of years ago. It cannot, therefore, mean that every descendant of Adam thus praised God, because many were not yet born. Neither can it mean that all then living praised him as the children of God, because the mass of mankind were then, as they are yet, enemies to God. But it was true then, that "the heavens declare the glory of God,"† and it is yet true that "surely the wrath of man shall praise thee: the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain."

In the same way that universal homage which is expressed in many of the above texts, is explained by an inspired writer. Besides other passages of the Old and New Testaments, the Apostle Paul is quoted as saying‡ "that in the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." The same Apostle has clearly shewn that such declarations do not contain the doctrine of universal salva-

*Isa. 55. 12.
†Ps. 19. 1.
‡ Phil. 2: 10, 11.
§ εν πασῃ τῃ κτισει.

tion, but that of a general judgment, after which he assures us that some shall be punished with everlasting destruction. The passage is in Rom. 14: 10—12. "But why dost thou "judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy bro-"ther? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of "Christ. For it is written, as I live saith the Lord, every "knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to "God. So then, every one of us shall give account, of him-"self to God." It would be strange indeed, for the Apostle to preach universal salvation as a motive to deter a mortal from judging his brother! Instead of this he reminds him that every tongue thus judging, must confess before the judgment-seat of Christ, and every stiff knee must bow there, however reluctantly. And let it be remembered that the Judge himself has already informed us of the result of this awful account. "Then shall he say also, unto them on the left hand, "depart from me, ye accursed into everlasting fire, prepared "for the devil and his angels."*

It has already been shewn in the refutation of the 7th argument, that Christ's *gathering* all things related to this same great consummation. In the context† it was shewn that at that period, he should put all things, that is, his enemies, under his feet. It was there said, that the scriptures affirm that this treatment is given to enemies, both by God and man.—When Joshua had conquered the five Kings of Canaan, he ordered his followers to bring them out of the cave in which they had taken refuge. "And they did so, and brought forth "those five Kings unto him, out of the cave, the King of Je-"rusalem, the King of Hebron, the King of Jarmuth, the "King of Lachish, and the King of Eglon. And it came to "pass, when they brought out those Kings unto Joshua, that "Joshua called for all the men of Israel, and said unto the "captains of the men of war which went with him, Come "near, put your feet upon the necks of these Kings. And "they came near and put their feet upon the necks of them. "And Joshua said unto them, fear not, nor be dismayed, be "strong and of good courage: for *thus shall the Lord do to all* "*your enemies* against whom ye fight."‡ He does not say that God will put put his feet upon their *sins*, but upon their *necks*; and that not as *children*, but as *enemies*. How utterly preposterous, then, to say, that when he speaks of putting all things and all enemies under the feet of Christ, and of his

*Matt. 25. 41.

† Eph. 1, 10. 22. 23.

‡ Joshua 10th.

destroying, subduing, and *subjecting* them, he means *saving* them!!

Those passages are of a different description, which represent Christ as not coming to condemn the world, but to save the world; not contending with men but shewing mercy to them; drawing, reconciling, shadowing, filling, justifying, and blessing them. And here it may not be amiss to notice a very few of the apparent inconsistencies of my opponent and other Universalist polemics. Although they dispute the inspiration of the Apocalypse, yet if Rev. 5: 13, will supply matter for declamation or sophistry it is used as good evidence, by my opponent,* or Mr. Ballou,† or any other. Although they profess to believe parables mere falsehoods, yet as Ezek. 17: 22—4, speaks of "*all* fowl of *every* wing," and "*all* the trees of the field," coming under the shadow of the "goodly cedar," this must be true, while they can see nothing but mere fiction in the torment of the rich man and others whose hearts are as a cage of unclean *birds*; or in casting out of the garden and into the fire, those fruitless *trees* which cumber the ground. My opponent denies the Divinity of the Son of God, and of course refuses to honour him as he pretends to honour the Father; yet to serve a turn, he blushes not to quote John 5: 23, which declares "that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father." Universalists deny that *everlasting* and *forever* denote an interminable duration; yet if God is said not to contend *forever*;‡ if he is said to exercise an *everlasting* love,§ to bestow an *everlasting* joy,¶ or an *everlasting* salvation,** they receive the words in their unlimited sense, without thinking any criticism necessary to prove it. So inconsistent are they, that for the sake of general words and phrases which may easily be perverted when detached from their connection, they will quote passages which contain the despised but essential doctrine of justification by faith, and even the destruction of the wicked.

In that class of texts now under review, these general expressions are the reliance of the Universalists. When Christ is represented as drawing and reconciling, shadowing and filling, justifying, blessing, and saving every creature, all men, all kindreds and nations, languages and tongues, they insist upon it, without one particle of proof,

*Minutes, p. 124.
† On Atonement, p. 209.
‡Isa. 57; 16.
§ Jer. 31, 3.
¶ Isa. 35. 10.
**Is. 45; 17.

that *all* and *every* must be understood universally, and as embracing each individual of the human race, from the creation of Adam to the consummation of all things. When the absurdity of this interpretation is shewn by a concise appeal to general usage, and to the terms and connexion of the authorities containing these expressions, this 9th argument shall be considered as answered.

Although a certain acquaintance of the Apostle John was known to but few of the human race, and hated and slandered by many of those who knew him, John says,* "Demetrious hath good report of *all* men." The Apostles knew comparatively few, and of them a goodly little number loved them. Yet our Saviour says to them† "Ye shall be hated of *all* men," "ye shall be hated of *all* nations for my name's sake." It is required‡ that "supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving of thanks be made for *all* men." Yet it is said,§ "There is a sin unto death; I do not say that he shall pray for it." The Universalist explanation of Paul's aphorism, "*all* things are lawful," would legalize even the sin against the Holy Ghost. In the universal sense, it is neither right nor possible for any one, wise or simple to believe *all* things or *every* word. Yet Paul tells us¶ that "charity believeth *all* things," and Solomon says** "The simple believeth every word." It is neither right nor possible for any one to please every child of Adam universally in any thing: yet Paul says†† "I please *all* men in *all* things." God told Paul‡‡ that he should be Christ's "witness unto *all* men." Paul called the Corinthians[a] his epistle "known and read of *all* men." When he said§§ that he preached Christ, "warning *every* man, and teaching *every* man in all wisdom," did he mean that he was infinitely wise, and that he imparted this wisdom to every individual of the human family? Did our Saviour make this the duty of any of the Apostles, when he sent them to "teach *all* nations," and to "preach the gospel to *every* creature?"¶¶ What did he mean, when he said "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in *all* this world, for a witness unto *all* nations?" or what did Paul mean, when he told the Collosians* that, in his day, the gospel "was preached to *every* creature which is under heaven," and "in *all* the world?"

---

*3 John 12.
‡ 1 Tim. 2; 1.
¶ 1 Cor. 13; 7.
†† 1 Cor. 10; 33.
§ Col. 1; 23.
‖ 23. 6.
†Matt. 10; 22. 24; 9.]
§ 1 John 5; 16.
** Prov. 14; 15.
‡‡ Acts 22; 15.
¶¶ Matt. 28; 19. Mk. 16; 15.
a 2 Cor. 3; 2.

It was told to Christ, "*all* men seek for thee."[a] The Scripture[i] says that many followed our Saviour "out of *all* cities;" that he "looked round about upon *all* things,"[k] "healing *every* sickness, and *every* disease among the people."[g] that even in the Apostolic day, "he maketh manifest the savour of his knowledge by us in *every* place;"[b] that he was "glorified of *all*;"[h] and that in the first century "*all* men glorified God."[n]

Paul says* that God, "in times past, suffered *all nations* "to walk in their own ways:" did he suffer *all individuals* so to walk? John says,† that a certain beast "causeth *all*, "both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to "receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads." Was this intended to be understood universally of all ages, or even of any particular age? God says, concerning Mystical Babylon "by thy sorceries were *all nations* deceived;" that "*all nations* have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her "fornication;" "she made *all nations* drink of the wine of "the wrath of her fornication."[d] He says that power was given to the Beast "to make war with the saints and to over-"come them: and power was given him over *all* kindreds and "tongues and nations." "And the kings of the earth, and "the great men, and the rich men, and the chief cap-"tains, and the mighty men, and *every* bond man, and *every* "free man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of "the mountains."‖ Concerning our Saviour's second coming, he says, "And then shall *all* the tribes of the earth "mourn."[q] "Behold he cometh with clouds; and *every* eye "shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and *all kindreds of the earth* shall wail because of him."¶ Here also, as well as in the prophet Ezekiel, we have some mention of what my opponents would, in this case, call parabolical fowls. "And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and "he cried with a loud voice, saying to *all the fowls* that fly in "the midst of heaven, come and gather yourselves together "unto the supper of the Great God; that ye may eat the flesh "of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty

---

a Mk. 1; 37.
i Mk. 6. 33.
g Matt. 9. 35.
h Luke 4. 15.
* Acts 14. 16.
† Rev. 13. 16.
d Rev. 18. 23, 3. 14. 8.
k Mk. 11. 11.
b 2 Cor. 2. 14.
n Acts 4. 21.
‖ Rev. 13; 7. 6. 15.
q Matt. 24; 30.
¶ Rev. 1. 7.

"men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, "and the flesh of *all men*, both free and bond, both small and "great."x Well might Peter say, "the end of *all things* is at "hand."z

Suppose for a moment that the word *all* or *every* must be interpreted in an universal sense. Then the above texts would prove that the Apostles pleased *all* men, and yet were hated of *all*; that they believed *all* things, and thought *all* things lawful, and yet preached to *all* men universally, that gospel which rejects *every* thing inconsistent with truth and righteousness. They prove that our Saviour, while on earth, was sought by *all* men universally, from *all* cities universally, and that, with his bodily eyes, he looked around upon *all* the human race of *every* age of the world, cured *all* their diseases universally, and diffused among them *all* universally "the "savour of his knowledge," so that *all* universally, whether in heaven, earth or hell, dead, living, or yet unborn, did, at that time, give glory to Christ and to God. Notwithstanding this, the above passages prove, according to this Universalist mode of interpretation, that *all* men universally walk in their own ways; that they receive the mark of the Beast; that they are deceived and made drunk by him, and brought under his power; that *all* men universally shall hide "themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains;" that *all* universally shall mourn and wail and finally be eaten up by "*all* the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven:" and after Paul's man who "believeth that *he* may eat *all things*,"q universally, has eaten *all* these fowls universally, then nothing will remain but to annihilate *him*, and Peter's "end of *all things*" universally shall have come to pass.

Universalists themselves see that in each of the above passages, and very many others which might be mentioned, these general expressions are used in a limited signification. So it is with the same expressions in that class of texts now under consideration. This will appear in the case of Gen. 12: 3, by simply quoting the *whole* verse. "And I will "bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: "and in thee shall *all* families of the earth be blessed." Now it is very well known that Balak the son of Zipporg is only one of many millions who curse the people of God. Therefore Balak and many others shall be cursed of God, and must

---

x Rev. 19. 17, 18.
q Rom. 14. 2.
g Num. 22. 6.
z 1 Pet. 4. 7.

be exceptions to the general promise given in the same verse, that *all* the families of the earth shall be blessed in Christ. Although in Ez. 17: 23, God promises that the goodly Cedar shall protect "*all* fowl of every wing;" yet in the next verse he promises that *all* the trees of the field shall know that he has "brought down the high tree" and "dried up the green tree," as well as "exalted the low tree" and "made "the dry tree to flourish." These that are *brought down* and *dried up*, must therefore be exceptions to the general promise made in the preceding verse.

When Christ is said to "fill *all* things," it means that he will fill the church of believers with *all* necessary gospel officers and ordinances. He is "the Head over *all* things "to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."[a] When in Eph. 4: 10, we are told that he fills *all things* the Apostle adds immediately, "and he gave some, Apostles; and some, prophets, and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till *we all*[b] come in the unity of the *faith*, [and not in unbelief,] and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Is there not a great difference between saying that Christ fills his church with all necessary ecclesiastical and spiritual supplies, for their edification in saving faith and knowledge, on the one hand; and saying on the other hand, as the Universalists pretend, that he fills with salvation hereafter all those who live and die without this knowledge and faith?

In Col. 1: 23, the Apostle informs us that if those to whom he wrote belonged to the *all things* which God reconciled to himself by Christ Jesus, as in verses 19, 20, then they would prove it by their faith and perseverance: "If ye continue in "the faith, grounded and settled, and be not moved away "from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and "which was preached to every creature which is under "heaven." The writer did not mean here that every creature universally had heard or believed the gospel: neither did he mean that all men universally were reconciled to God, but those only who continued in the faith, rooted and grounded. In Rom. 11: 15, the same Apostle is so far from attributing universality to this reconciliation, that he informs us that the reconciliation of the Gentile world was effected by

a Eph. 1. 22, 23. b That is, the body of Christ.

the casting away of the Jews. "For if the *casting away* of "them be the *reconciling* of the world, what shall the re- "ceiving of them be but life from the dead?" As in this passage, *the world*, a general word, is used to distinguish the Gentiles from the Jews, so in the 32nd verse, the word *all* is used to embrace both Jews and Gentiles generally, though not universally. "For God hath concluded them *all* in "unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." This appears from the fact that throughout the chapter, and particularly in the two preceding verses, faith and mercy, unbelief and rejection are used as interchangeable terms; from which we are left to understand, that God will "have mercy upon all" believers, whether Jews or Gentiles, and cast away all unbelievers, whether they be branches of the olive-tree or the wild olive-tree. Certain it is that the Apostle James[b] did not think that God would "have mercy upon all" indiscriminately, but only upon those who shew mercy to others. "For he shall have judgment without mercy, that hath "shewed no mercy." And notwithstanding the doubts of some, these Apostles, Paul and James, spoke the same thing, and by the same Spirit, both on justification and condemnation,

But Mr. Ballou[c] seems to think that he can admit this much, and yet prove universal salvation, by shewing that all universally shall be blessed with faith. For this purpose, after quoting the promise that in Christ "shall all the nations of the earth be blessed," he informs us unequivocally that this *blessing* is *justification through faith*, and refers to Gal. 3; 8, for his proof. "And the Scripture foreseeing that "God would justify the heathen through faith, preached be- "fore the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all "nations be blessed." But suppose that he does justify all the heathen through faith; is this saying that he will justify *all men* universally through faith? What will he do with the Jewish branches of the olive tree, concerning which the same Apostle says[d] "because of *unbelief*, they were broken off?" And it is a matter of historical evidence that millions of them have died in this unbelief. But observe that the promise that God "*would* justify the heathen through faith," never was intended to take effect to any great extent, until the Christian dispensation; before which time, millions of the Gentiles had died in unbelief. Mr. Ballou, instead of

b 2; 18.
c On Atonement, p. 195.
d Rom. 11. 20.

claiming for himself and the rest of the heathen, the honor of being Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise, ought to remember that our Saviour said to such vain pretenders; "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham."[e] That many perform not the *works* of Abraham *in this life* is too plain from Scripture and daily observation; and it is declared upon infallible authority, that "there is no *work*, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither thou goest." If therefore, salvation depends upon Abraham's faith and work, and if there are some who neither believe nor work here nor hereafter, there are some who are lost in this world and the world to come. When my opponent reminds us that our Saviour came not to condemn the world, but to save the world, it would be well to recollect also that he has said, and has commanded his servants to say, "he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned."[f]

In those very passages which speak in direct terms, of the Father giving all things to the Son, the context proves that *all men* were not given to him as his followers, neither does he claim them as such. In Luke 10: 22, he says "all things are delivered to me of my Father." But no farther back than the preceding verse, he had thanked that Father, that in his sovereignty, he had hidden the things connected with salvation, from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes:[g] In John 3: 35, he says, "the Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." But no farther on than the next verse he says, "He that believeth on "the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not "the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth "on him." In John 17: 2, he says, "Thou hast given him "power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as "many as thou hast given him." Yet in the next verse he tells us that this eternal life is connected with that saving knowledge, for the lack of which an inspired prophet[h] tells us that many are destroyed. In verses 6—9, we are expressly taught that this knowledge is manifested not to the *world* universally, but to those whom the Father had given him *out of the world*; and by them it was believingly received.

To prove that Christ does not lose one of the human race which they say is universally given to him, they quote John 6: 39; "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me,

e John 8. 39.
f Mk. 16. 16.
g See also Matt. 11; 25. 27.
h Hosea. 4: 6.

"that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, "but should raise it up again at the last day." But the very next verse proves that none but believers are raised to everlasting life. "And this is the will of him that sent "me, that every one which seeth the Son, and *be-* "*lieveth* on him, may have *everlasting life*: and I will raise "him up at the last day." To shew that all men were not possessed of this faith, through which some receive eternal life, our Saviour says, in the 64th verse, "But there are "some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the "beginning, who they were that believed not, and who should "betray him." The Universalist position which we are now discussing, says that "the Father has given him, and he claims for his *followers*, all men universally." But the 66th verse of this same 6th chapter of John, says, "From that time many of his *disciples* went back, and walked no more with him." Here then are some who, after having been his professed *followers*, became offended at his heavenly doctrine; *followed* him no longer; and thus fell short of that eternal life which is connected with faith.

The only remaining authority under this head is John 13: 3, in which Jesus is represented as "knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands." But to his own family he says in the 10th verse, "ye are clean but not all." Now without holiness no man shall see the Lord. In John 6: 64, just now quoted, it is intimated that Judas the traitor was one of those who "believed not:" he therefore was this unclean person. In the verse immediately preceding the authority now in hand, and in a subsequent verse of the same chapter,* it is said that *the devil* put it "into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray" Christ; and that for this purpose, "Satan entered into him." As one cannot serve two masters, and Judas had undertaken the service of Satan, and was therefore an unclean unbeliever, he was not a *follower* of Christ. But in the 35th verse, our Saviour announces a rule which evidently leaves many others in the same disgrace. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another."

Let it be remembered that the argument under discussion is as follows;——Christ saves all his followers whom the Father has given him;——But the Father has given him all men universally as his followers;——Therefore all men universally shall be saved. After an examination of the au-

* John 13: 2, 27.

thorities advanced in support of the minor proposition of this syllogism, it appears from the context and the whole tenor of God's word, that the Father has not given to Christ *as his followers*, all men universally, but only those who repent, and believe, obey and love. The argument therefore falls to the ground.

TENTH UNIVERSALIST ARGUMENT.

Christ's Priestly Office. Do not the scriptures give us frequent assurances that the High Priest of our profession atones and intercedes for all men? In 1 Tim. 2: 1, he requires us to *pray for all men:* Will *he* then pray for a part only? No wonder that he would exercise this function of his priestly office in behalf of all, when he gave his life for all. In 1 Cor. 15: 3, it is said that "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures." Now when we refer to these scriptures as in Dan. 9: 24, do we not find that instead of some remaining under their sins forever, the atonement makes an end of all sins? "Seventy weeks are determined upon "thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgres-"sion, and to make *an end of sins*, and to make reconciliation "for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and "to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most "Holy." "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save "his people from their sins."* "He shall redeem theirsouls "from deceit and violence:"† That is, from sin and punishment. "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was "bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace "was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. *All* "we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one "to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the ini-"quity of us *all*. He shall see of the travail of his soul and "shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous ser-"vant justify *many*; for he shall bear their iniquities."‡ "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ "died for the *ungodly*."§ "For Christ also hath once suf-"fered for sins, the just for the *unjust*, that he might bring "us to God."¶ "Who died for us that whether we wake or "sleep, we should live together with him."a "God is no "respecter of persons."b "For therefore we both labour and "suffer reproach because we trust in the living God, who is "the Saviour of *all men*; especially of those that believe."c

* Matt. 1: 21. † Ps. 72: 14. ‡ Isa. 53: 5, 6. 11.
§ Rom. 5: 6. ¶ 1 Pet. 3; 18. a 1 Thess. 5; 10.
b Acts. 10; 34. c 1 Tim. 4; 10.

"For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus "judge, that if *one died for all*, then were all dead: and that "*he died for all*, that they which live should not henceforth "live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and "rose again."* "The Father sent the Son to be the Sa-"viour of *the world*."† "For God so loved *the world* that "he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in "him should not perish but have everlasting life. For God "sent not his Son into the world to condemn *the world*, but "that *the world* through him might be saved."‡ "Behold "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of *the world*."§ "And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours "only, but also for the sins of *the whole world*."¶ "For the "grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared unto "*all men*."[a] "But we see Jesus who was made a little low-"er than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with "glory and honor, that he by the grace of God, should taste "death for *every man*."[b] "Who gave himself a ransom for "*all*, to be testified in due time."[c] He "delivered him up "for us *all*."[d] "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ "shall *all* be made alive."[e] "But not as the offence, so also "is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many "be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by "grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath aboun-"ded unto *many*. And not as it was by one that sinned, so "is the gift; for the judgment was by one to condemnation, "but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one, much "more they which receive abundance of grace and of the "gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus "Christ. Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment "came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righ-"teousness of one, the free gift came upon *all men* unto jus-"tification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many "were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall *many* "be made righteous.—Moreover the law entered that the "offence might abound: but where sin abounded grace did "much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, "even so might grace reign through righteousness, unto "eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."[f]

---

* 2 Cor. 5; 14, 15.
§ John 1; 29.
b Heb. 2; 9.
e 1 Cor. 15; 22.
† 1 John 4; 14.
¶ 1 John 2; 2.
c 1 Tim. 2; 6.
f Rom. 5; 15—21.
‡ John 3; 16, 17.
a Tit. 2; 11.
d Rom. 8. 32.

Do not these passages prove that Christ, in his Atonement, takes away our sins and makes an end of them? that he redeems the soul from deceit and violence, so as to give us peace for his chastisement, and healing by his stripes? Is it not declared that through his condemnation and death, he procures for us, justification and eternal life? And is it not affirmed by great strength and variety of expression, that he is a ransom for *all*, the Saviour of *every man*, of *the world*, and of *the whole world*? And as he spared not his life can he withhold his intercessory prayers? especially as he commands us to pray for all? May we not therefore reason that—Christ saves all for whom he dies;—He dies for all men universally;—Therefore all men universally shall be saved?

On this subject Mr. Ballou reasons as follows, viz. "God "would not have given his Son a *ransom* for *all*, if it were "not his *will* that *all* should be saved; and if it be God's *will*, "it ought to be ours, therefore it is right to *pray* for *all*. If "the ransom were paid for *all*, it argues, that it was the in-"tention of the Ransomer, that *all* should be benefited. What "would have been the astonishment of the world after the "immortal Washington had caused to be paid a ransom for *all* "the American prisoners who were in Algerine slavery, if "he had told the Dey that he did not want more than one "quarter of those captives sent home to the land of liberty "and to the enjoyment of their families, for which they had "so long sighed in bondage; and that he might wear out the "rest with fatigue and whips? But the good man's soul was "never satisfied until they *all* came home, and with songs of "joyous liberty hailed the land of their nativity! And bles-"sed be the Captain of our salvation; he, also, shall see of the "travail of his soul and be satisfied, when all the ransomed of "the Lord shall return and come to Zion, with songs and "everlasting joys upon their heads, when they shall obtain "joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."*

My opponent *also* quotes Isa. 53: 11. "He shall see of "the travail of his soul and be satisfied." He then speaks as follows, viz. "I think there is no christian but will agree "with me that this is spoken in relation to the salvation by "Jesus Christ. Then I ask will the Messiah, Christ, the "Son of God, be satisfied with coming short of what he came "into the world to do? And for what did the Redeemer's

* Ballou on Atonement, p. 205.

"soul travail? What did he come into the world to do? His "soul travailed for the spiritual birth of the world. He "came into the world to save it. If, then, this is not done, "will he be satisfied? But 'he shall see of the travail of his "soul'. The word, travail, here means labour, sorrow and "trouble; and Jesus was a man of sorrows, and acquainted "with grief. I dare say there are many in this assembly "who know the full meaning of the metaphor without far-"ther explanation; and to bring the matter home to them, "may I not be permitted to apply it in a natural sense, and "modestly ask this question, is it possible that any thing "short of the birth or deliver*ance* of all for whom the soul "travaileth should give satisfaction? If two or more were "the cause of the labour, would such a soul be satisfied with "the birth of one? Certainly not. Just so it is, in relation "to the travail of the Redeemer's soul: and if this travail, "this labour, toil, and bloody sweat be undertaken for all "mankind, —— and who can say it was not, —— must not "all men be born again, and consequently be saved, before "the Redeemer's soul is satisfied? Yes, my hearers, for he "never can be satisfied with any thing short of it."[a]

A disciple of Winchester, might strengthen the argument by the following view of the passages already quoted.

1. They prove the incompetency of man to his own salvation. In 2 Cor. 15: 14, it is said that "if one died for all, then were *all dead*." In Rom. 5: 6, it is said that "when we were yet *without strength*, Christ died for the ungodly." *Ungodly* sinners who are *all dead*, and *without strength*, cannot save themselves.

2. They prove the design of Christ in suffering, and the design of the Father in sending him. He came to "save his people from their sins;"—"that he might bring us to God;"—"that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him;"—"The Father sent the Son to be the *Saviour* of the world;"—"that the world through him might be saved,"

3. They prove that Christ actually tasted death as a substitute for sinners; for substitution is the force of the word *huper*,[b] *for*, in several of the passages adduced. He tasted "death, *huper*, *for* every man;"[c] that is, as the substitute of every man. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just, *huper*, *for* the unjust;[d] that is, as the substitute of the

a Minutes, pp. 290, 291.
b ὑπερ
c Hebr. 2: 9.
d 1. Pet. 3: 18.

unjust. "For when we were without strength, in due time, Christ died, *huper*, *for* the ungodly. For scarcely, *huper*, *for* a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure, *huper*, *for* a good man some would even dare to die; but God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died, *huper*, *for* us."[a] On this last verse Doddridge, who is by no means a Universalist, quotes a note of Raphelius from Zenophon, after which he remarks that Raphelius "has abundantly demonstrated that *huper hemon apethane*[b] signifies *he died* in our room and stead: nor can I find that *apothanein huper tinos*[c] has ever any other signification than rescuing the life of another, at the expense of our own; and the very next verse, (i. e. verse 7.) shews, independently of any other authority, how evidently it bears that sense here, as one can hardly imagine how any one would die for a good man, unless it were to redeem his life by giving up his own."

In 1 Tim. 2: 6, the word rendered *ransom*, contains the idea of substitution as clearly as the preposition which accompanies it. "Who gave himself *a ransom for all, antilutron huper panton*."[d] On this subject, Turrettin, who was far from Universalism, says, "The word *lutron* might "admit of quibbling, but nothing can be more express than the "word *antilutron*. It denotes not merely a price, but such a "price as is perfectly equal to the debt which it pays; this "is the force of the preposition *anti* which expresses *sub-*"*stitution*. Aristotle, who surely understood the Greek lan-"guage, uses the word *antilutron* in the 9th book of his "Ethics, and 2d chapter to denote the redemption or pur-"chase of a life by substituting another life in its room."

4. This supposed disciple of Winchester, might urge, moreover, from the foregoing authorities, that in virtue of this substitution, men are not merely brought into a state of *salvability*, but a state of *salvation*. Paul does not say that Christ *may be* the Saviour of all men, but that he "IS the Saviour of all men."[e] He does not say that grace *may* bring salvation, and *may* appear to all men; but "the grace of God that *bringeth* salvation *hath appeared* to all men;"[f] and "where sin abounded, grace *did* much more abound."[g] He does not speak of a possible, but of a positive justification. "The free gift *came* upon all men unto *justification of life*."[h]

---

a Rom. 5; 6—8.
b ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανε
c ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ τινος
d ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων
e 1 Tim. 4; 10.
f Tit. 2; 11.
g Rom. 5; 20.
h Rom. 5; 18.

that eternal *judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries.* That this means a condemnation to eternal fire after the general judgment, is evident from its being here contrasted with the most fearful temporal punishment, and represented a much sorer punishment; and from its being represented in chap. 6, verse 2, as an "eternal judgment," succeeding the resurrection from the dead.

Here then are Jews and Gentiles, who are determined to follow their own way of justification and sanctification. Some sin through the guile of false teachers, and others sin wilfully and knowingly. It is declared that Christ is of no effect to either of them; that neither the sacrifice of Christ, nor any other sacrifice shall profit them; but that after the resurrection of the dead, they must expect to be adjudged to eternal fire. Were the Father and the Son disappointed in their fall? No more than in that of rebel angels. Without either the one or the other, the Holy Jesus shall be satisfied, in receiving the full amount of the travail of his soul.

2. There are some from whom their own debt will be exacted to the utmost. This immaculate Redeemer speaks a very intelligible language on this subject, in his sermon on the mount. "Agree with thine adversary quickly whilst thou "art in the way with him; lest at any time, the adversary de-"liver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the of-"ficer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto you, "thou shalt by no means, come out thence, till thou hast paid "the uttermost farthing;" "the very last mite."* When the Apostle tells the Galatians that on account of their reliance on circumcision, Christ should profit them nothing; that is, he should not pay their debt, he informs them that in consequence of their self-righteousness, they should be held accountable themselves. "For I testify "again to every man that is circumcised, that he is "a debtor to do the whole law." Like the debtors mentioned in Luke 7: 41. 42, one owes five hundred pence and the other fifty, and they have nothing to pay: for our Saviour says, "without me ye can do nothing," and these debtors have rejected him to depend upon themselves. Now here are persons deeply in debt, and perfectly insolvent, while running at large, in this world, and they are sentenced by an infallibly righteous Judge, to imprisonment hereafter, until the uttermost farthing is paid; and paid not by our Surety, whom they have rejected, but by themselves. If the

* Matt. 5; 25. 26. Luke 12; 59.

debt had been paid by the Surety, justice would have procured their release. They would not only have been preserved from the eternal prison, but delivered from the chains of unbelief in this life. Their being confined by infinite justice, as debtors to do the whole law, is a proof that Christ, who is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth, did not satisfy the law, as the Surety of these particular debtors, any more than of fallen angels. It was in Christ's priestly office, that he paid the debt of believers by satisfying the law in their behalf: but here are unbelievers who are held personally responsible for the last mite. They, therefore, can have no interest in his meritorious substitution. and must be exceptions to those general expressions, in which he is said to be the Saviour of *all* men. As they have rejected Christ, and can do nothing without him, their insolvency is irremediable, and their confinement, of course, eternal. In this awful, but righteous dispensation, the Holy Trinity is not disappointed in any of its plans. The design of the Atonement is fully answered in the salvation of those for whom it was made In their regeneration to holiness, and resurrection to glory, the Redeemer "shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied."

To Mr. Ballou's illustration of this subject I can see no valid objection. General Washington could not be satisfied with the return of a less number of Algerine captives, than he had ransomed, But when he was fully satisfied in the return of *all* his ransomed countrymen, there remained behind, and there yet remain, many prisoners who are doomed to that severe servitude, until they shall pay the last mite of their own ransom. Does not this prove that they had no interest in Washington's ransom?—that it was not intended for them? but only for his own countrymen? This may appear a censurable partiality in Washington: Godwin may condemn him for loving his countrymen more than foreigners, as he has censured parents for a peculiar attachment to their own children, and as many censure Christ for a peculiar regard to his sheep, in laying down his life. Although I approve of all these attachments, it is not their morality that is now before us. The question is, did Christ ransom all men universally, or only such as he shall actually deliver from condemnation, corruption and punishment? Did he ransom those, who, according to his solemn declaration, shall be kept in prison, until they pay their own debt, to the very last mite? No more than Washington ransomed those unhappy Europeans who

are still in Algerine bondage. But those whom Christ has left in hopeless punishment, are his enemies: and if any American in Algiers had manifested that rancorous and traitorous hostility to his country's President and constitution, which Mr. Ballou and my opponent have evinced toward Christ's Divinity and Atonement, Washington would either have left him in Africa, or brought him home to the enjoyment of that rope which he had prepared for Arnold.

3. It has been proved in the refutation of the 9th Universalist argument, that general terms are very often, if not generally, used in a limited signification. A dissertation was given on the word *all*, a word which frequently occurs, and on which much stress is laid, in the texts brought to support this 10th argument. The evidence there adduced, shows that in the passages here cited, this word *may* be used in a limited sense, but in some of these texts it proves not only that it *may be*, but that it *is* thus used. In one of them,[a] Paul exhorts that "supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for *all* men;" and Mr. Ballou insinuates that this is a proof of the universality of Christ's priestly office. Now it is a well known fact, that the Scriptures deny a universal intercession, both in his case and in ours. In John 17: 9, he says, "I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine." And although in the passage from 1 Tim. we are exhorted to pray for *all* men generally, yet in 1 John 5: 16, we are relieved from praying for the unpardonable sin. This, then, establishes a matter of criticism, the meaning of the word *all*; and a matter of doctrine, the objective extent of Christ's priesthood. It is here asserted by himself, that he intercedes for none but those whom the Father has given him, and these are contrasted with the world, as constituting a part and not the whole of mankind. And would he die for those whom the Father, in divine sovereignty has not given him, and for whom he will not pray? I might rather ask, will not the Holy Trinity conspire to bestow every benefit upon those from whom it has not withheld Heaven's greatest blessing? "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for *us all*, [that is, for believers like Paul; all whom the Father had given him; for he gave *us* to him, and him to *us*;] how shall he not with him also freely give *us* all things?"[b] Thus it appears that he imparts every necessary blessing to those for whom he died;—But there are

a 1 Tim. 2; 1. b Rom. 8:32.

some from whom he withholds the benefit of his intercession, which is essential to their welfare;—Therefore there are some for whom he did not die. To show that his sacrifice and intercession, (both sacerdotal functions,) are coextensive, and that they are effectual to the salvation of all for whom they are made, we cannot easily invent plainer words than Paul uses in Rom. 8: 34. "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for *us*." Here it is said concerning the same class of mankind, that Christ died and rose again, and intercedes in Heaven for them. This class is denoted by the pronoun US, the same US to whom, in the preceding context, he promises every good thing, because he had delivered up Christ for them. The question is, does this US embrace the world universally, or a part of mankind, who are given to Christ out of the world? Our Saviour has not more unequivocally limited his intercession, than his Apostle, in this 8th chapter, from first to last, limits his atonement. In the very first verse these US are described as being in Christ Jesus, and walking after the Spirit. In verse 9th he says, "now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." How many have another spirit in them! He says that they suffer with him.[a] How different from those who trample on his blood! They are saved by hope:[b] whereas many die in despair. They pray by the aid of the Spirit. How different from those who blaspheme, or who pray denying the Son and the Spirit! They love God[c] whereas in verse 7th, there are some who hate God. These loving, praying, hoping, suffering souls, who are in Christ, and have Christ and his spirit in them; these are the very ALL and the very US for whom, as in verses 32. 34, Christ was delivered up; and for whom he died and arose again, and intercedes at the right hand of God. These characteristics do not belong to all men universally: neither do the atonement and intercession of Christ.

Returning to the point of criticism now in hand, it may be observed that the word *world*, and the phrase, *the whole world*, found in some of the texts to be examined, are generally used in a *limited* sense. 1. The Roman Empire in the Augustan age. "There went out a decree from Cesar Augustus, that *all the*

---

a Verse 17.
b Verse 24.
c Verse 28.

"*world* should be taxed."[a] 2. A multitude in a certain age or "country. "The Pharisees therefore said among themselves, "perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? Behold! *the world* "is gone after him."[b] 3. The churches generally in the "first Century. "I thank my God, through Jesus Christ, "for you all that your faith is spoken of throughout *the* "*whole world*."[c] 4. Believers in general. "For the bread "of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth "life unto *the world*:" that is to believers, as the whole "chapter proves; in which he says "I am the bread of life: he "that *cometh* to me shall never hunger; and he that *believeth* "on me shall never thrist." "I am the living bread "which came down from heaven." "If any man *eat* of this "bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I will "give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of *the world*."[d] 5. Those who are not given to Christ. "I pray not for the "*world*, but for them which thou hast given me."[e] 6. For those whom the Father has given him, and for whose redemption he was slain, but particularly of the Gentiles, as distinct from the Jews. "Now if the fall of them [the Jews] be the "riches of the *world*, and the diminishing of them, the riches "of the *Gentiles*, how much more their fulness!"[f] "And he "is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but for the sins of *the whole world*."[g] Does he mean that he is the propitiation not only for the sins of believers, but for the sins of unbelievers? —— not only for the penitent and obedient, but for the incorrigibly impenitent and disobedient? Would not this make men indifferent to faith and holiness, and would it not teach that Christ became a propitiatory sacrifice for those whose cause he would not advocate in heaven as their interceding High Priest. That he wrote to excite an abhorrence of sin, and to teach that Christ's intercession and propitiation were coextensive, is evident from the preceding verse. "My little children, these things I write unto "you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an ad-"vocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." For whom is he an advocate? "I pray not for *the world*, but for "them whom thou has given me." For their sins then, he is a propitiation. These are called *the whole world*, as Paul in the first sense given above called Gentile believers the *world*, in contradistinction from the Jews, who thought that they were

a Luke 2. 1.
b John 12. 19.
c Rom. 1. 8.
d John 6. 33. 35. 51.
e John 17. 9.
f Rom. 11. 12.
g 1 John 2. 2.

forever to monopolize the benefits of revealed religion. The Apostles themselves relinquished this prejudice with great reluctance, even after the ascension of our Lord and the descent of the Holy Ghost. When Peter's pertinacity was overcome by the grace of God, accompanied with extraordinary visions, and communications, and effusions of the Spirit, "then Peter opened his mouth, and said, of a truth I perceive "that God is no respecter of persons:" that is, he has not now that exclusive love for the Jews, a mistaken apprehension of which made me unwilling to visit this Gentile family; but I find that he is a respecter of all men alike. How? Has he an equal respect for believers and unbelievers? Let Peter speak for himself. "Of a truth I perceive that God is "no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that *fear*-"*eth* him, and *worketh* righteousness is accepted of him."[a] The Apostle John contended with the same prejudices and difficulties, and he comes to the same conclusion. "He is the "propitiation for our sins; [that is, for the sins of us belie-"ving Jews,] and not for ours only, but for the sins of the "*whole world*:" that is for all in every nation, who fear "God and work righteousness. That he was slain for the "redemption of such and such only, the same Apostle has "declared in Rev. 5: 9. "For thou wast slain, and has re-"deemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred and "tongue, and people and nation." When therefore, we are "told that Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole "world, we are to understand, (himself being judge,) that "he redeems believers out of every nation: as when he tells "us, that in the day of judgment, "*all kindreds of the earth* "shall wail because of him,"[b] he means that unbelievers, out of all kindreds shall be condemned and punished. Thus it appears that these general expressions are often used in a limited signification, and that their limits are defined by the writers who use them.

4. Before engaging in a fuller examination of the texts brought to support a universal atonement, one more point seems to claim our attention. While the purchase of the Redeemer is often denoted by general expressions with a limited signification, the boundaries of his blood-bought family are also frequently defined by limited expressions in an exclusive sense. Such a fact should relieve us from all difficulty in the explanation of texts relating to this subject.

---

a Acts 10: 34. 35. b Rev. 1; 7.

The church invisible is pointed out in Scripture under the denomination of sheep and people, friends and brethren, children, bride, and body. In the day of judgment the *sheep* shall be placed on his right hand and the *goats* on the left. But the Judge himself said, during his humiliation, "I lay down my life for the *sheep*."[a] The *goats* then are excluded from his atonement, as they shall be from his glory. He received the name of Jesus, because "he shall save his *people* from their sins."[b] There are many *people* unwilling to the last, to receive him as a Saviour from sin. To the exclusion of these, it is said, "thy *people* shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauty of holiness."[c] Many of this sort of *people*, whom God had determined to make willing, were in Corinth in Paul's day; for God told him, "I have much *people* in this city."[d] Did this embrace the heathen *population* universally? Not unless they were universally willing to renounce sin and follow holiness, through the spirit of a holy Saviour. Although Christ died for his enemies, it was only for those whose enmity was to be destroyed. In John 13: 14, he speaks of dying for his *friends* to the exclusion of those, concerning whom he shall say in the great day, "But these mine *enemies*, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me."[e] There are some who are ashamed of Christ in this crooked and perverse generation. Of these he has said that he will be ashamed before his Father and the holy Angels. To the exclusion of these, therefore, he says of some, that "he is not ashamed to call *them brethren*." This is only two verses after Hebr. 2: 9, where it is said that "he should taste death for *every man*:" or as it might be more consistently translated, "for *every brother*," from verse 11th; or "for *every child*," from verse 13th: for let it be remembered that this is the evident meaning of the writer, since the word *man* is only given him by our translators, and he actually mentioned *brethren* and *children* as the exclusive subjects of the atonement. This observation concerning *children* is confirmed by the inspired words of Caiaphas, who "prophecied that Jesus should die for that nation, and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one, the *children* of God that were scattered abroad."[f] These *children* of God have thus far been a sparse

a John 10; 15. c Ps. 110. 3. d Acts 18. 10.
b Matt. 1. 21. e Luke 19. 27.
f John 11; 51. 52. How this resembles 1 John 2; 2, in expression and meaning!

population, but they are destined one day to fill the earth. They are the travail of the Redeemer's soul, with which he shall be satisfied. "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his *seed*, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand."[a] Instead of confusing the spiritual *seed* with the *seed* of the serpent, which embraces incorrigible offenders, the Scriptures contrast them. To the serpent God says, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy *seed* and her *seed*." If he had intended to embrace both in the promise to Abraham, "and in thy *seed* shall all the nations of the earth be blessed,"[b] he would have given us the word in the plural and not in the singular number. "Now to Abraham and his *seed* were the promises made: he saith not, and to *seeds*, as of many, but as of one, and to thy *seed*, which is Christ:"[c] that is, Christ mystical, embracing all the members of that one body of which he is the head; for "Christ is the head of the *church*, and he is the Saviour of the *body*."[d] Does this *body* include that Man of sin, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped? Does this "*church of God* which he hath purchased with his own blood,"[e] include the *synagogue of Satan?* The inspired illustration of the context, makes it as palpable that it does not, as language can make it. "Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the *church* and *gave himself* for it."[f] Here, then, we have the extent of the atonement plainly defined. Our Saviour proves from the very creation of one pair in the beginning, that the connubial attachment should be exclusive. He has therefore pronounced judgment upon every roving emotion of the heart. The more we confine this affection, to its proper object, the more we resemble the Lamb of God in his love to the heavenly *bride*.[g] Would this be the case if he had had an indiscriminate attachment to his own church and the synagogue of Satan?—if he had *given himself*, that is, if he had made an atonement, for the man of sin and his own body indifferently? As, then, his atonement is, in infinite and adorable sovereignty, made for *men* to the exclusion of *devils*, so is it made for his own church invisible, to the exclusion of the devil's church among men. It is made for his sheep to the exclusion of the goats; for his people friends and brethren, to the exclusion of

a Isa. 53; 10.
b Gen. 22; 18.
c Gal. 3; 16. See Jamieson's Sacred History.
d Eph. 5. 23.
e Acts 20. 28.
f Eph. 5. 25.
g Rev. 21. 9.

those who remain enemies, and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise; for his seed, children, bride, and body, to the exclusion of the seed of the serpent, the generations of Amalek, and those who persevere in loving the creature more than the Creator.

The discussion of the above four particulars was intended to facilitate and curtail the explanation of the authorities advanced for a universal atonement. In its progress several of those texts were partly, and some sufficiently cleared. The first of those which remain, was, if I mistake not, used by Dr. Chauncey, that great champion of Universalism, from whom many of the others also were taken. It is 1 Cor. 15: 3, "Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures." Whose sins are these? They are the sins of *us*; and in what was said in Rom. 8th, in the 3rd head above, it will be recollected that the *us* for whom Christ died, was composed of believers. In this case the same thing appears from the verse immediately preceding. "By which also ye were *saved*, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have *believed* in vain." By putting these 2d and 3rd verses together, we find that Christ's dying for our sins, is the meritorious cause, and faith the instrumental cause of our salvation.

But this is said to be according to the scriptures; that is, of the old Testament: for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy, and Moses wrote of him. There, the redemption of Christ is usually adumbrated by a temporal redemption. "What nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to *redeem* for a people to himself?"[a] This temporal redemption, however, was from God's peculiar love to Israel, to the exclusion of other nations, and at their expense. This is attested by the law and the prophets. Moses says "I will put a division, (Engl. margin and Hebr. a redemption,) between my people and thy people."[b] Isaiah says, "Thus saith the Lord your Redeemer, the Holy One of "Israel; for your sake I have sent to Babylon, and have "brought down all their nobles and the Chaldeans whose cry "is in the ships." "For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy "One of Israel, thy Saviour. I gave Egypt for thy ransom, "Ethiopia and Seba for thee. Since thou wast precious in "my sight, thou hast been honourable, and I have loved thee; "therefore will I give men for thee, and people for thy life."[c]

---

a Ex. 15. 13. b Ex. 8. 23.
c Isa. 43. 3. 14. See Jamieson's Sacred History.

This love of God to Israel caused him so to redeem them, that this *redemption* served as a *division* or *distinction* between them and other nations. It is so peculiar that other nations, with their *men* and *people*, are said to be given for the *ransom* of the Israelites.

In 1 Cor. 5: 7, Paul plainly alludes to the Old Testament history, in such a way as to shew us what he meant by saying that "Christ died for our sins according to the Scrip-"tures." "For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for "us." This is *our* Passover, the Passover of *us*; which *us* he speakes of in the next verse as keeping the ordinance "with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth," and as differing very widely from some who had the old leaven of malice and wickedness, like the Egyptians of old, between whom and the Israelites, God made the typical Passover a redemption or mark of distinction. He said to Moses, "It is "the Lord's passover. For I will pass through the land of "Egypt this night, and will smite all the first born in the "land of Egyt, both man and beast: and against all the "Gods of Egypt I will execute judgment. I am the Lord. "And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses "where you are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over "you, and the plague shall not be upon you, to destroy you, "when I smite the land of Egypt."[a] For whom was this typical passover sacrificed? Was it for all men universally? It was for the Israelites alone, to the exclusion of those stubborn foes who sank to the bottom of the Red Sea. For whom is Christ our antitypical Passover sacrificed? For whose sins did he die according to the scriptures? For the spiritual Israel who believe in his name, and not for those incorrigible enemies, who sink, in just judgment, to the bottomless pit.

The next passage which claims our attention is Dan. 9: 24. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and "upon thy Holy City, to finish the transgression, and to "make an end of sins, &c." Its being said here that the Messiah comes to finish transgression, and to make an end of sins, is considered evidence of universal salvation, because there can be no state of eternal sin and misery, after *all* transgression and sin shall have been finished and brought to an end. But according to their explanation, this text not only proves that there will be no sin nor punishment af-

a Ex. 12. 11—13.

ter death, but that there has been no sin nor punishment for near two thousand years past; for it was then that the Messiah came and fulfilled this prophecy. The word here translated *finish*, is, in one of the Psalms,[h] correctly rendered *refrain*. "I have *refrained* my feet from every "evil way, that I might keep thy word." My opponent himself will admit that David did not mean that he had *finished* his feet by annihilation, or that he had obtained a perfect deliverance from sin and sorrow in this life. In other places[a] it is rendered *stay* or *restrain*. "Therefore "the heaven over you is *stayed* from dew, and the earth is "*stayed* from her fruit." "So the people were *restrained* "from bringing work for the offering of the sanctuary." Would my opponent understand from these passages, that the *heavens* and the *earth* and the *people* were *finished* by annihilation? Neither did the Messiah come to *finish* transgression in this sense, but to *restrain* it, as our translators have rendered it in the margin of the text under consideration. What is meant by his making an end of *sins*, or *sin-offerings* as it is elsewhere rendered,[b] is made clear in the close of the chapter, where it is said, "he shall cause the "sacrifice and the oblation to cease." These typical *sins* or *sin offerings* were of no farther use, after God had "made him "who knew no sin, to be *sin* or a *sin offering* for us, that we "might be made the righteousness of God in him."[c] To say that he made an end of sins, so that no sin should be afterward committed or punished, is not only contradicting the scriptures, but contradicting palpable matter of fact.[d]

Other passages are in the writings of John, where Christ is represented as "the Lamb of God which taketh away the "sin of the world:"[e] that is the sins of believing Gentiles; whereas the typical lamb was slain for Jews only, and that not to cleanse the conscience. In this sense the same writer tells us that "the Father sent the Son to be the Sa-"viour of the world."[f] Whether this embraced stubborn unbelievers, our Saviour himself declares. "For God so "loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that "whosoever *believeth* on him should not perish, but have "everlasting life."[g] This is as much as to say that the Father gave the son to die for those who should believe.

---

a Ex. 36 6. Hag. 1. 10.
b Levit. 4. 3, 25. 29.
c 2 Cor. 5. 21.
h 119. 101.
d See Dr. Wylie's numbers on Universalism, in the Presbyterian Magazine.
e John 1. 29.
f 1 John 4. 14.
g John 3. 16.

A few passages of Paul's writings yet remain, which contain the same doctrine. One represents God as the "Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe."[a] This shows that there is a salvation peculiar to believers. It is true, God is the Saviour of unbelievers who forget him: but he is only their Saviour from temporal calamities, such as the bondage in Egypt. The Psalmist[b] says that the idolatrous Israelites "forgat God their *Saviour*, which had done great things in Egypt." But although God *saved* them from the tyranny of Pharaoh, he says concerning some of them, "so I sware in my wrath, they shall not enter into my rest." "And to "whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but "to them that *believed* not? So we see that they could not enter in because of *unbelief*."[c] Although they had hardened their hearts through the deceitfulness of sin, God was still their Saviour, Deliverer, Preserver. But in the same sense, the Psalmist says, "Lord thou *savest* man and beast."[d] This is a literal translation of the original and the Septuagint. Although God was the Saviour of the godly and ungodly, believers and unbelievers, Paul makes a great distinction between them. He says, concerning those who believed the gospel, "there remaineth, therefore, a rest to the people of God:" Whereas "they to whom it was first preached, entered not in because of unbelief."[e] This is a comment upon the same Apostle's declaration that "God is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe." But we have a similar comment in the context of the passage itself: where he says "godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." Thus God is the Saviour or preserver of all men in this life, but especially of those that *believe*, because *they* are preserved and blessed forever.

The context will also explain the general expressions used in 1 Cor. 15: 22. "For as in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive." The next verse says, "But every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming" The *all* that are made alive in Christ are here said to be "they that are Christ's," that is, all who belong to Christ. Now does not the same Apostle tell us that none belong to Christ, but those who have his Spirit? "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is

a 1 Tim. 4. 10.
b 106. 21.
c Hebr. 3; 11. 18, 19.
d 36. 6.
e Heb. 4: 6. 9.

none of his."[a] Although there is to be hereafter a general effusion of the Spirit, it is so far from being universal in all ages, that some who have enjoyed its miraculous gifts, and who have even been personal acquaintances and professed disciples of Christ, shall be pronounced none of his. "And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart "from me, ye that work iniquity."[b] As, therefore, the workers of iniquity, who are destitute of the Spirit of Christ, do not belong to him, and never did, they shall not be made alive in him; wherefore the word *all* must here be understood in the sense which is limited by the subject to which it is applied. The meaning of the passage is simply this. "As in Adam *all* [that belong to Adam] die, so in Christ, *all* [that belong to Christ] shall be made alive."

The last passage to be noticed in the latter part of Rom. 5, in which it is said that "the free gift came upon *all* men "unto justification of life," and "by the obedience of one "shall *many* be made righteous." We have already seen that the word *all* is often used for a part of mankind, and the younger Edwards[d] has proved, in opposition to Dr. Chauncy, that the same thing may be said of the word *many*. The whole chapter shews that these *all men* who receive *justification of life*, and these *many* who are *made righteous*, are *justified* and *made righteous* through faith. The chapter begins, "Therefore being *justified by faith*, we have "peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom "also we have access *by faith* into this *grace* wherein we "stand, and rejoice in *hope* of the glory of God." He lets us know that these *all men* are the same pious *us* of which he speaks so often. Besides that *faith* and *hope* already attributed to them, he says in verse 5th, "the *love* of God is "shed abroad in *our* hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto *us*." In verse 4th, they have *patience* and *experience*. In verse 10, they are *reconciled to God*. No wonder then, that in verse 17, they are said to have "abundance of grace "and of the gift of righteousness." Are all men universally *patient* and *experienced* christians? have all men *faith*, *hope*, and *love*? Are all universally reconciled to God? Is the Holy Ghost given to all men? Not so. But let it be remembered that Paul says in this same epistle, "if any man "have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Christ himself has declared that he that believeth not shall be damn-

a Rom. 8. 9.
b Matt. 7: 23.
c οἱ πολλοὶ
d Of his writings and his father's, free use is made in this discussion.

ed, and that his enemies, who *love* him not, shall be slain before him. Surely if all men universally enjoyed *justification unto life*, our infallible judge would not *condemn*[a] some to be slain.

What makes it evident beyond a reasonable doubt, that these *all men* are believers, is, that the 18th verse, in which they are said to be justified, is introduced by *therefore*, as an express inference from the 17th, in which they are said to receive *abundance of grace*, as well as the gift of righteousness: and in verse 2nd they are said to "have access by "*faith* into this *grace*." His promises in verse 17th are concerning believers, and are therefore particular. This calls for a particular and not an universal conclusion. As he does not draw any of those *lame conclusions* of which my opponent's friends and the enemies of God accuse him, his inference in verse 18th must be confined to believers, which were contemplated in the promises. And Dr. Chauncy's fear that this interpretation would confound the antithesis maintained from verse 12th to the close, is entirely without foundation, as his great antagonist has shown. Is there no antithesis in saying that as the world of sinners transgressed and died in the first Adam *their* federal head, so the world of believers are justified and saved in the second Adam, *their* federal Head? This is the doctrine of the chapter, of the epistle, and of the scriptures.

The argument from the extent of Christ's atonement is considered the citadel of Universalism. The result of the examination which it has now received is, that there are some who are not profited by Christ's atonement, but must be sent to prison until they satisfy for themselves, which they can never do. Many plain authorities have been advanced, which shew that Christ died exclusively for those who shall be saved; for his sheep and people, brethren and friends, children and bride, body and church. It has also been shewn by the context of Universalist authorities that the sacred writers mean believers, even where they use such general expressions as *many, all, every, the world*, and *the whole world*, in relation to this subject. We conclude therefore, that unbelievers must perish.

In the course of this discussion my opponent has been represented as an enemy to the Atonement. The word occurs in our translation of Rom. 5: 11. In his Lecture on this passage, he says, "if this word had been correctly translated,

a The meaning of the word damn.

"the word *atonement*, and of course the doctrine of atone-
"ment, as it is now understood, would not have been found,
"(as it is not contained) in the New Testament. Neither is
"the doctrine of atonement, i. e. in the sense of making sa-
"tisfaction to divine justice, by the means of a suffering vic-
"tim, any where to be found in the Bible." Soon after, in a note, he makes a similar remark concerning "the commonly received doctrine of atonement by vicarious sufferings."[a] For farther information, he refers us to the article *atonement*, in Priestley's History of the Corruptions of Christianity, a work which he earnestly recommends to the attention of his readers. Of this work, its own author in the last century, professed to give a compend in this desk; in which he says, "I
"regard with horror such doctrines as those of transubstan-
"tiation, the trinity, *atonement*, and other *corruptions of*
"*christianity*." Here then, is the consistency of my opponent and his Universalist and Unitarian friends. They quote scripture to prove their point, although in this very work of Dr. Priestley's, recommended earnestly by my opponent, the inspiration of the Scriptures is as unequivocally denied as in Thomas Paine's Age of Reason. They urge an argument from the extent of Christ's atonement, which presupposes his vicarious satisfaction, and is perfectly nugatory without it; yet they dare, in the face of high heaven, to express as blasphemous an abhorrence of the *atonement* and its author, as could be expected from devils incarnate. Yet this is the man who calls me brother.[b] After thus impiously insulting my Divine Master, he gives the sacred name of brother to his unworthy servant. Worthless as I am, I desire no such confraternity. "O my soul! come
"not thou into their secret; unto their assembly, mine honour
be not thou united."

---

a See Lectures, pp. 105. 106.

b. Minutes p. 256. "But my brother,—yes, I say my brother, though he is my opponent in this debate,—says he."

DEFENCE.

PART SECOND.

Thus much concisely concerning the arguments of the Universalists. My own evidence for the Orthodox opinion may now be expected. Preparatory to this, allow me to say a few things concerning the true statement of the question, and the sources from which this evidence shall be drawn. Nothing but the subtlety of Universalist writers makes it necessary, formally to declare that these sources are the inspired oracles exclusively. Mr. Balfour insinuates that we consider the Bible rather scarce of proof, and that on this account, we resort to uninspired Jewish authority. The doctrine of the Targums which he has proved to be on our side, appears to grieve him. He also shews that the Apocrypha which Mr. Winchester had quoted against us,[a] is really in our favour: and it is very remarkable that they generally denote the state of eternal torment by that word [b] which is used in the account of the rich man and Lazarus.[c] Although he gives us Josephus and Philo also, we lay but little stress on such writers, in doctrinal matters. If however, my opponent is driven to the hard necessity, of resting an affair of criticism upon uninspired Jewish authority, it would surely be more reasonable to resort to them, than to that Hebrew Professor whom he is so often calling upon in this debate. Instead of comparing Spiritual things with Spiritual, and determining the meaning of Scripture words by scripture usage, he is perpetually appealing to my friend the learned Professor, an uninspired Hebrew, for an ultimate decision on the meaning of the words of inspiration. So anxious is he to have him for an umpire between us,

a In his 4th Dialogue he quotes Wisdom xi. 23—26. xii. 1, 2. 16. xv. 1. 2.
b ᾅδης *Hades.*
c 2 Esdras, ii. 29 iv. 2. viii. 53. Tobit xiii. 2. Wisdom xvii. 14. Ecclus. xxi. 10. li. 5, 6. Song of the three children, verse 68.

that he calls upon him no less than four times in the same half hour. In the last of these instances he says, "I now once more "call upon my opponent to submit to the determination of this "point depending on the meaning of these words to the decision "of the Professor, and if he will not consent, I appeal to the "Professor myself, or to any other competent person who "may now be present, to tell me if I am wrong."[a] Thus my opponent who unjustly accuses us of servile regard to human authority, actually goes begging for some Father Confessor, either Jew or Gentile, to tell him whether he is right or wrong: and while he professes not to know what opinion the umpire may express, he promises submission to his *determination* in matters of doctrine and criticism. We might as well decide the question by lot. He has been long challenging the clergy "to discuss this important subject with him." Is this decision by unknown and uninspired arbitrators what he means by a discussion? In ascertaining the meaning of words, we should look for higher authority than the mere assertion of any man living? yet in an affair of this sort, my opponent gives Dr. Campbell of Aberdeen and a gentleman of this city, who is really a greater man, as paramount authority. Says he "I give them as *my authori-* "*ty* for not using these words according to the common ac- "ceptation."[b] These gentlemen are really in my favour; yet the Bible itself is *my authority*.

With regard to the christian church in general, and in every age, my opponent is much more modest and more correct. He appears to know that his system has never been considered a part of their religion, In his article on the word *Universalists*, in the spurious edition of Buck's Theological Dictionary, he says, "The sentiments of the Univer- "salists were embraced by Origen in the third century, and in "more modern times by Chevalier Ramsay, Dr. Cheyne, Mr. "Hartley and others:" Although I could not, with Bishop Horsley, deny Origen's credibility in matters of fact, the whole Christian world will admit that a diminution of his heathenish eccentricities, would have been a great addition to his Christian character. His follies were many: yet a total denial of future punishment, a doctrine which my opponent has borrowed from Mr. Huntingdon, and which he advocates in this debate, is not acknowledged to be among the articles of Origen's creed. The above extract is, how-

a Minutes pp. 161. 163. 166. 2 ice.
b Minutes pp. 166. 176.

ever, an indirect confession of a remarkable fact, that Universalism in any shape, had no footing whatever in the church of Christ, until Origen, and very little since his day. Clemens Romanus who probably heard some of the Apostles preach, says, "All souls are immortal, even those of the impious; to "whom it would be better not to be incorruptible. For as "they are punished by inextinguishable fire, with an eternal "punishment, and do not die, they can obtain no end to their "great evil." With this testimony Justin Martyr and Irenaeus agree. When Origen swerved from this Scriptural doctrine, he taught that the wicked were subjected to an eternal alternation of misery and happiness. This is represented by Augustine as one of Origen's *dogmas which the church did not receive*; one which is inexcusable and indefensible; and one which is to be VEHEMENTLY ABHORRED BY EVERY CHRISTIAN, WHETHER LEARNED OR UNLEARNED. As his own belief and that of the scriptures and the church, he tells us, "that Christ shall appear in the consummation of the world, "to judge it, and that he will raise all the dead, and will "give to pious men eternal life and perpetual joys; but will "condemn impious men and devils, that they may be punish-"ed without end." He shortly adds; "and we condemn "the Origenists, who pretended that there will be an end of the future punishment of condemned men and devils:"[a] From the time of Christ to the present day, this doctrine of Augustine has been the creed of all christendom, with the exception of Hobbes, Spinosa, Priestley, and Huntingdon, with those Atheists, Deists, Unitarians, and Universalists who choose to follow them.

Among their devoted followers my opponent occupies, at present, a conspicuous station. He has debated and lectured, preached and printed largely in their defence. For his publications he claims much of your esteem, because as he has told you, they have not yet been censured, although sent to all the Universities and Colleges in the United States, for their critical examination, and respectfully submitted to the whole body of American clergy of every sect and denomination. He forgot to tell you that he had requested them to pay the postage of their remarks. Their refusing to do this, he takes for a certificate of approbation. This is quite an easy way of becoming famous. It must be because my opponent is

a See Lampe's Philologico-theological Dissertation on the Eternity of Punishment.

extraordinarily modest, or because he is saturated with applause, that he has not procured the same renown among the clergy and the colleges of Europe. And if refusing to write remarks upon every trifle, and transmit them by mail at their own expense, be considered a favourable attestation, there is no doubt that Captain Simms's Lectures on the practicability and importance of penetrating to the centre of our globe through a supposed opening at the north pole, might soon receive the respectful, though silent approbation of all the literary and ecclesiastical establishments on the surface of the earth, and even of those interior regions which he wishes to explore.

But how comes it to pass, that after having vauntingly submitted his books to unlimited investigation, and challenged all America to discuss with him the subjects of which they treat;—how comes it to pass that after these steps, my opponent should object to my noticing these very books, in a debate which arose from the acceptance of his challenge? You have heard him make bitter complaints of my referring to those works which *he* has brought into question: and although he has heretofore boasted that they contained an unanswered and an unanswerable defence of that doctrine which he here advocates, he has now become so much ashamed of them as openly and repeatedly to declare in your hearing, that "they have no bearing upon the point whatever." Again, he says, "Now I would ask, what *has* the writings of your "speaker to do with the question before us for discussion?"[a] What strange literary phenomena must these books be!! A Universalist *Version*, or to speak more properly, a Universalist *Perversion* of the New Testament, adorned with Unitarian notes, and yet having nothing to do with the Universalist question now under discussion! "A series of Lectures on the "Doctrine of Universal Benevolence, delivered in the Uni-"versalist Church," by a Universalist preacher, and yet they have no bearing on the point now in hand! It is not wonderful that he should deny the bearing of my arguments: It is natural enough for such a character to deny that even the case of the rich man and Lazarus has any relation to the question: But must he not have incurred a doleful dizziness in the dust of debate, before he could say this of his own elaborate and boasted productions, which were written professedly in defence of Universalism? If, however, his report be

a Minutes, pp. 27, 28.

true, that his works on Universalism say nothing to the point, it is easy to account for the silence of the American literati. With the exception of a few Unitarian establishments, which are in the habit of dealing in such wares, no College to whom they were sent, would think them worth the postage.

Worthless as they are, I shall still take such notice of them as I would of the works of Dr. Priestley, Thomas Paine, or any other infidel They all bear testimony against their authors. Although my opponent, in denying the inspiration of certain books of Scripture, endeavours to shield himself under the name of Dr. Lardner and the Improved Version, any person of understanding, who reads his quotations from them in his New Testament, will see that he is responsible for the sentiments there expressed. Although he has, of his own motion, in your presence, taken an awful oath "before that God who is the searcher of all hearts," that he maintains an "unbounded faith in the volume of Revelation,"[a] he still adheres to that earnest recommendation which his Lectures give of that work of Dr. Priestley, in which the inspiration of that volume is denied in the roundest terms. How can these two things be reconciled? It is only a less learned and a less witty Voltaire, taking the sacramental obligation of the Lord's Supper. When, in the call of Providence, I have vowed an adherence to the Scriptures, it was done sincerely. Whether, therefore, in this debate, I quote my opponent or any other writer, on either side, I shall still treat the Bible, with *the whole* of its sacred contents, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

It is of importance to have well defined views of the real question to be supported by such authority. In this respect justice is seldom done to the orthodox. "Is the punishment "of the *wicked* absolutely eternal?" Instead of this question about the punishment of the *wicked*, my opponent would persuade you that I have undertaken to prove that the greater part of the universe will be destroyed. His words are the following, viz. "But my opponent would have you be-"lieve that the adversary, or devil, if you please, that goeth "about as a roaring lion, is heir to most of the creatures "whom God hath made." In another instance he would insinuate that, according to my doctrine, God will "doom the "greater portion of his helpless offspring to never ending tor-"ment."[b] I have never promised nor attempted to prove

a Minutes p. 76.
b Minutes pp. 123. 179.

such a thing. My object is to prove that God will doom the *wicked* to eternal torment. If these embrace the greater part or the whole of his creation "though hand join in hand, "the wicked shall not be unpunished." But what evidence have I, or what evidence has my opponent that this character will fit "the most of the creatures whom God hath made?" Does either of us know what proportion of the angelic throng fell from the happiness of heaven? Can either of us tell what proportion of the human race shall be regenerated and saved through Jesus Christ? Thus far it is true, "many be "called but few chosen:" but when we consider the vast accession which the church is to receive from the incalculable population and the general piety of the millenial day, we know not that the wicked shall bear a greater proportion to the righteous, that our convicts in prison do to the citizens at large. "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many "angels round about the throne, and the beasts and the elders: "and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thous-"and, and thousands of thousands." "After this I beheld, "and lo! a great multitude which no man could number, of "all nations, and kindreds, and people and tongues, stood "before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white "robes and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud "voice, saying salvation to our God, which sitteth upon the "throne, and unto the lamb." a

The question is not whether we wish all men saved, or whether we hate the wicked, or love sin, but whether God has determined that incorrigible sinners shall be eternally punished. Yet Mr. Ballou would charge the orthodox with the above evils. While charitably representing them as the Prodigal's elder brother, as the "grumbling" labourers who bore the heat and burthen of the day, and as the murmuring Scribes and Pharisees, he asks, "Is it hard to see that my "opponent has made a very fair and full profession of his "love to sin in room of his love to God; and a strong "desire to injure his fellow men in room of serving them in "love?" "At what do my opposers rage? At what are "they dissatisfied? Not because I exclude them from any "privilege or blessing of the gospel. What then? I am "sorry to name it. It is because I extend those blessings "farther, and hope they will do more good than what suits "them!" b To this it may be answered that Universalism

a Rev. 5; 11, 7; 9, 10. b On Atonement pp. 223, 224.

is an attempt to *exclude* us from the truth, which is an essential *privilege* and *blessing of the gospel*. Without *rage*, we are *dissatisfied* at this attempt. We hate falsehood and iniquity; and, through grace, we love God and our fellow creatures. Labours for the general diffusion of gospel blessings are certainly one mark of this love. The orthodox have been enabled to do something in this way. But Mr. Ballou says, "I EXTEND THOSE BLESSINGS FARTHER." Vain man! What has he ever done for the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom? Does he suppose that his mere word can raise the dead? Or that his pen can write their names in the book of life? And yet the arrogant assumption of these prerogatives of Heaven, is the amount of Universalist exertions for the salvation of sinners. While, for this purpose, the Orthodox risk every expense and danger, and are instrumental in saving millions, not only in word but in deed, their enemies deride their pious labours, and continue crying peace peace, when there is no peace. They deny our moral malady, and of course will not apply the remedy. "The "whole head is sick and the whole heart faint. From the "sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness "in it; but wounds and bruises and putrifying sores: they "have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified "with ointment." The Orthodox see mankind to be in this condition, and, like the good Samaritan, they endeavour to apply the oil and the wine. For this *service of love*, they are reviled and opposed by the whole Iscariot band. Yet these Universalist and Unitarian priests and Levites, who passed by on the other side, boast of their superior skill, industry, and success in the healing art. After they have, in their own conceit, banished all disease from the earth, by a blast of their nostrils, and, with a dash of their pen, pronounced all men perfectly sound, they flap their triumphant wings, and proclaim to the world, "We extend the blessings of "health farther than it suits the good Samaritan to do." There is no better way of answering such empty and invidious boasting, than in the words of Job.[a] "But ye are forgers "of lies, ye are all physicians of no value."

While it *suits* the lovers of truth to preach the gospel to every creature, saying, "he that believeth and is baptized "shall be saved," it *suits* them to say moreover, "he that be-"lieveth not shall be damned." And it is this unbeliever, one who lives and dies in a state of corruption and condem-

a 13: 4. b p. 58.

nation, that is meant by the *wicked*, in the question now under discussion. "Is the punishment of the wicked absolutely eternal? or is it only a temporal punishment in this world, for their good, and to be succeeded by eternal happiness after death?" It has already been shewn that these two propositions exhibit the two sides of one and the same question. The latter clause, which was designed to present the negative of the main question in a peculiar form, my opponent has undertaken to support. In his 4th Lecture,[a] he says, "My evidence will be derived from two sources: *first* "from the law of reason; and *secondly*, from the law of the "scriptures." To shew you how perfectly unnecessary it is to meet him on the ground of reason, I will give you only one instance of his skill in this way, where he has made sad work of the attributes of God, as well as of the human constitution. The following are his own words, viz. "In a Philosophical sense, there is not full power, so long as the effect is not produced; for all that we know of power is by "the effect."[b] It is easy to see that this principle would prove not only our own inability to procure, but the inability of the Creator to bestow, any blessing, cerporeal or spiritual, temporal or eternal, which has not already been obtained. And this he calls *philosophy*!

CONFIRMATION.

To prove that the punishment of the wicked is absolutely eternal, my evidences shall be brought from the word of God. The importance of the subject and the necessity of giving it a candid and devout attention have already been urged. My proofs shall be given under five heads. 1. This doctrine shall be fairly *inferred* from the scriptural account of the attributes of God, and the character and condition of mankind. 2. Several scripture texts shall be produced, which, in various forms of expression, *imply* this doctrine. 3. It shall be shewn that the scriptures point out such a *contrast* between the righteous and the wicked, as to their character, standing, and future destiny, as can be satisfactorily explained, only by admitting the eternal punishment of the wicked. 4. Its eternity shall be proved by *negative* expressions of scripture, in which its termination is plainly *denied*. 5. It shall be proved by passages of scripture, in which the doctrine is *affirmed*. Thus you have my division, under the denominations of *inference*, *implication*, *contrast*, *negation* and

a p. 85. b Presbyt—m verses Presbyt—m, p. 15.

affirmation. These terms, used for convenience, were the best that I could procure. The two first appear synonimous: though it will be found that the first is a deduction from general doctrines, and the second from particular figures of expression.

FIRST ORTHODOX ARGUMENT.

INFERENCE.

This doctrine shall be fairly *inferred* from the scriptural account of the attributes of God, and the character and condition of mankind. As these are topics to which both parties resort, the impartial consideration of the divine attributes, postponed from the 5th Universalist argument, was promised in this place. These we propose to treat of in two classes; which, from the appearance of things, and for distinction's sake, we will call the milder and the severer attributes of God. The various subjects embraced under this first argument, shall with divine assistance, be considered in the following order. 1. God's goodness, love, mercy and grace, 2. In connexion with these, the scriptural plan of salvation. 3. God's justice and righteousness, holiness and truth. 4. In connexion with these, the scriptural account of sin. 5. The helplessness of sinners. 6. In connexion with this, the scriptural account of the character, influence and dominion of that society to which the curse has exposed and subjected them.

I. The milder attributes of God, such as goodness, love, mercy, and grace. To shew what we are to expect from these, my opponent quotes such as the following passages. "For great is thy *mercy* toward me; and thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell." "They shall abundantly "utter the memory of thy great *goodness*, and shall sing of "thy righteousness. The Lord is *gracious*, and full of *com-* "*passion*; slow to anger, and of great *mercy*. The Lord is "*good to all*; and his *tender mercies* are over *all* his works." "Thou openest thy hand and satisfiest the desire of *every* "living thing." "That ye may be like your Father which "is in Heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and "on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and unjust."[a] On this subject, Mr. Winchester, in his Fourth Dialogue, asks his friend the following question. "If you had as much pow- "er as good will, would you not bring all to bow to the scep- "tre of grace, and to be reconciled to God through Jesus

a Ps. lxxxvi. 13. cxlv. 7. 8, 9, 16. Matt. v. 45. Minutes pp. 121, 179, 180.

"Christ?" In order to prove that God's goodness will impart happiness and salvation to all whom he knows and governs, that is, to the universe, Mr. Ballou says, "If God "be infinitely good, his goodness is commensurate with his "power and knowledge; then all beings, whom his power "produced, are the objects of his goodness; and to prove "that any being was destitute of it, would prove that "Deity's knowledge did not comprehend such being."[a]

If these men have spoken truly, and handled the Scriptures aright, they have proved several very strange things!

1. As we are, in this, as well as in the future world, the subject of God's knowledge and power, and as he exercises infinite goodness toward all the subjects of his infinite knowledge and power, therefore we must enjoy a perfect exemption from all pain, and the full satisfaction of all our desires, in this world as well as that which is to come! Men who can, by so plain an implication, deny the suffering condition of this groaning and travailing creation, under the omniscient inspection of Almighty God, are ready, with Berkeley, to deny the existence of matter, and with Hume, to deny the existence of mind.

2. The use which they have made of Matt. v. 45, shews that they do not think faith and holiness necessary to our acceptance with God; but that he is equally favourable to the evil and the good, the just and the unjust, not only in sending temporal blessings, such as the sun and the rain, but in bestowing salvation. That this doctrine does encourage sinners to live in unbelief, and in the exercise of the most awful presumption, cannot be concealed from the knowledge of Universalists themselves. Here we need not recount facts which have occurred in our own country. or in this city. We shall be satisfied with one which came under Mr. Winchester's own observation. In his Fifth Dialogue he says, "A "*Reverend Divine*, whom I knew, (living not long since) had "encouraged this wickedly presumptuous disposition, so far "as openly to say, *God cannot damn me; he can as soon cease* "*to be God, as he can cast me off; even though I should sin* "*ever so much. If I should kill a man, he could not damn me;* "*nay if I should kill all the men in the world, he cannot damn* "*me.*" Although Mr. Winchester had taught that God's good will and power were commensurate in their application;—the very doctrine which the above blasphemer applied to his own case; his ears are so stunned by the hissings

a On Atonement p. 102.

of his own brood, that he is obliged to condemn and expose the fruit of his own labours. He says, "At length the displeasure of the Almighty coming visibly upon him, this "rhapsodist changed his tone, and exclaimed that *God had "forsook him*!" He then proceeds to "advise all men of that "bold, presuming, self-confident spirit, to read and consider "well those words in Jer, xxii. 24. 'As I live, saith Jehovah, "though Coniah, the son of Jehoiakim, King of Judah, were "the signet upon my right hand; yet would I pluck thee "thence.'"

3. If the principles and authorities advanced by my opponent, and Messrs. Winchester and Ballou are relevant, they not only prove the present and eternal salvation and uninterrupted happiness of men and devils, believers and unbelievers, but of the *irrational* creation universally. They quote Ps. cxlv. 16. "Thou openest thy hand, and *satisfiest the desire of every living thing*," By this passage I understand that the daily provisions of the young lion, the raven, and the sparrow come from God, and that not one of these creatures falls to the ground without his knowledge. But many do fall to the ground and perish, with their desires satisfied or unsatisfied. So Providence sends all the comforts which men enjoy, yet many die because their wants are not supplied, and many perish forever because their wicked desires are satisfied. "For the wicked boasteth of his heart's desire, and blesseth "the covetous, whom the Lord abhorreth." "So they did eat, "and were well filled; for he gave them their own *desire*: "they were not estranged from their lust. But while their "meat was yet in their mouths, the wrath of God came up-"on them, and slew the fattest of them, and smote down the "chosen men of Israel." "And he gave them their request, "but sent leanness into their souls." "The *desire* of the "wicked shall perish."[a]

The view which the Orthodox give of the attributes of God is reasonable and scriptural. They never pretend to measure the perfections of God by the objects upon which they are exercised; for if they were, they must either find an infinite creation, or a finite Creator. Are the milder attributes of God less than infinite, because he has pronounced and inflicted a curse upon the inferior creation in consequence of Adam's fall? Are these perfections diminished because "man is born unto trouble as the sparks fly upward?" God foreknew, foretold, and brought to pass the

a Ps. x. 3. lxxviii. 29. cvi. 15. cxii. 10.

destruction of Jerusalem; in which tender mothers were impelled by the phrenzy of *unsatisfied* hunger, to eat the *desire* of their eyes. Did these sufferings, or did the ineffable anguish of the Divine Redeemer, when bearing the curse due to our offences, tarnish the infinite lustre of the divine goodness? As infinite power has created a finite universe, so has infinite sovereignty made a limited application of divine mercy.

That this application of mercy is more limited than our finite creation, will appear from plain declarations of Holy Writ. The season of its exercise is there spoken of as a time of light, a day of grace, of salvation and of visitation, of God's presence, to open the eyes of sinners, and make their hearts tender and fruitful. The express limitations of this season of mercy may now be given in the following particulars.

1. The scriptures speak of a time of light, which, with regard to some, lasts for a limited period, and is followed by darkness. "Then Jesus said unto them, yet a little while "is the light with you. Walk while ye have the light, lest "darkness come upon you; for he that walketh in darkness, "knoweth not whither he goeth, While ye have the light, "*believe* in the light, that ye may be children of light."[a]

2. There is a limited day of grace, after which sinners are hardened. "Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith, to day if "ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the "provocation, in the day of temptation, in the wilderness." "But exhort one another daily, while it is called to-day; "lest any of you be hardened through the deceitfulness of "sin."[b]

3. God has ordained an accepted time, and appointed a limited day of salvation and of visitation. "Thus saith the "Lord, in an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day "of salvation have I helped thee." "For he saith, I have "heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation "have I succoured thee: Behold! now is the accepted time, "behold now is the day of salvation." "And when he was "come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it: saying, if "thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the "things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid "from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that "thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass

---

a John xii. 35 36. b Hebr. iii. 7, 8, 13.

"thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay "thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; "and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; "because thou knewest not the *time of thy visitation*." "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon "him while he is near." "For this shall every one that is "godly, pray unto thee in a time when thou mayest be found. "Surely in the floods of great waters they shall not come "nigh unto him:" "Then shall they call upon me, but I "will not answer; they shall seek me early, but they shall "not find me-"[a]

4. There is a time when those who walk in the darkness of depravity, and harden their hearts, and blind their eyes, and refuse to seek the Lord, or call upon his name, shall, like barren trees, be cut down, and cast into the fire, and thus deprived forever of that mercy which they here despised. "Then said he unto the dresser of his vineyard, behold! these "three years I come seeking fruit on this fig-tree, and finding "none: cut it down; why cumbereth it the ground?" "And "now also, the axe is laid unto the root of the trees; therefore "every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn "down, and cast into the fire." And there we are plainly told they shall lie, and never be able to rise again. "If the "tree fall toward the south or toward the north; in the place "where the tree falleth, there it shall be." "There are the "workers of iniquity fallen: they are cast down, and shall "not be able to rise." "Because I have called, and ye refus-"ed; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; "but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of "my reproof: I also will laugh at your calamity: I will "mock when your fear cometh: When your fear cometh as "desolation, and your destruction cometh as a whirlwind; "when distress and anguish cometh upon you: Then shall "they call upon me, but I will not answer; they shall seek "me early, but they shall not find me: for that they hated "knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord: They "would none of my counsel: they despised all my reproof: "Therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their own way, and "be filled with their own devices: For the turning away of "the simple shall slay them, and the prosperity of fools shall "*destroy* them." We need hardly mention that Paul calls this, being "punished with *everlasting destruction*."[b] Thus

a Isa. xlix. 8. 2 Cor. vi. 2. Luke xix. 41—44. Isa. lv. 6. Ps. xxxii. 6. Prov. i. 28.

b Luke xiii. 7. Matt. iii. 10. Eccles. xi. 3. Ps. 36. 12. Prov. i. 24—32. 2 Thess. i. 9

shall stubborn unbelievers have judgment without mercy.

II. Having shewn that the eternal punishment of the wicked is fairly inferred from scriptural limitations of divine mercy to those who embrace this mercy by faith, (a doctrine which has, in one shape or another occupied our time from the commencement of this debate,) much has, of course been anticipated, in proof that the scriptural plan of salvation infers the eternal punishment of incorrigible offenders. God has shewn plainly the channel through which exclusively his salvation is conveyed to lost sinners. It is through the love of God, the mediation of Christ, the operations of his Spirit, the dispensations of his Providence, the revelation of his will, and a corresponding subjugation of our will to his. All who are saved, must, according to the scriptures, be saved in this way. That there are some sinners who are not saved in this way, and must, of course, be eternally lost, may be concisely shewn by an induction of particulars.

1. The love of God. From what was said above, of God's milder attributes, such as his goodness, love, mercy, and grace, it appears, that there are some whose day of light and grace, of visitation and salvation, shall be succeeded by darkness and despair, banishment and everlasting destruction. It was proved that they should have judgment without mercy, and divine wrath instead of love. Before Rebecca's children were yet born, or had done good or evil, God said "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated."[a] Their lives corresponded with their respective destinies: and there is not an iota of evidence that God's love shall ever be withdrawn from pious Jacob, or his hatred removed from wicked Esau. "What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with "God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, I will have "mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have com-"passion on whom I will have compassion." There are thousands who are so much engaged in making laws for their Creator, and passing judgment upon his actions, that they fall short of that repentance to which his goodness might otherwise lead them. "Despisest thou the riches of his "goodness and forbearance and long suffering; not knowing "that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? but "after thy hardness, and impenitent heart, treasurest up "unto thyself, wrath against the day of wrath, and revela-

a Rom. 9; 10—15.

"tion of the righteous judgment of God, who will render to "every man according to his deeds."[a]

2. The mediation of Christ. In what was said of Christ's offices, under the 8th, 9th, and 10th Universalist arguments, it was proved that although he was the light of the world, there were some who loved darkness rather than light, and who should be cast into the blackness of darkness forever, ——that although he was the universal sovereign, some of his subjects would continue rebellious, and should be slain before him;——and that although he was a successful High Priest for Jews and Gentiles, without respect of persons, it was only for those among them who feared God and wrought righteousness, only for those whom the Father had given him. For the lost part of mankind he refuses to pray. Nay, he prays against Judas, and his spiritual children who have since canonized that Arch Traitor. "Add iniquity unto "their iniquity, and let them not come into thy righteousness. "Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be "written with the righteous." "Set thou a wicked man "over him, and let Satan stand at his right hand. When he "shall be judged, let him be condemned, and let his prayer "become sin." "Let there be none to extend mercy unto "him; neither let there be any to favour his fatherless chil-"dren." "Let this be the reward of mine adversaries from "the Lord, and of them that speak evil against my soul." These are the words of the Spirit of Christ, and these are the scriptures which were fulfilled, when the son of perdition went to his own place.[b]

3. The operations of the Holy Spirit. "If ye live after "the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye, through the Spirit do mor-"tify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as "are led by the Spirit of God, they are the Sons of God." "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none "of his." "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, "he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." But there are some concerning whom God has said, "My Spirit shall not "always strive with man." "But they rebelled and vexed "his Holy Spirit: Therefore he was turned to be their ene-"my, and he fought against them." "Whosoever speaketh "against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, "neither in this world, neither in the world to come."[c]

---

a Rom. 2; 4—11.
b John 17; 12. Acts 1; 16—20, 25. Ps. 69; 27, 28. 109; 6—20.
c Rom. viii. 13. 14. 9. John iii. 5. Gen. vi. 3. Isa. lxiii. 10. Matt. xii. 32.

4. The dispensations of Providence. "All things work "together for good to them that love God, to them who are "the called according to his purpose." In the reception of sanctified mercies and sanctified afflictions, they grow in knowledge, grace, and usefulness. That it is not so with the wicked, is attested by those who have seen them in prosperity and adversity. "I was envious at the foolish, when "I saw the prosperity of the wicked. For there are no "bands in their death; but their strength is firm. They "are not in trouble as other men: neither are they plagued "like other men. Therefore pride compasseth them about "as a charm; violence covereth them as a garment. Their "eyes stand out with fatness; they have more than heart "could wish. They are corrupt, and speak wickedly con-"cerning oppression; they speak loftily. They set their "mouth against the heavens, and their tongue walketh "through the earth." "They shall fret themselves, and curse "their King and their God, and look upward." "And men "were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name "of God, which hath power over these plagues: and they "repented not to give him glory. And the fifth angel "poured out his vial upon the the seat of the beast; and his "kingdom was full of darkness; and they gnawed their "tongues for pain; and blasphemed the God of Heaven be-"cause of their pains and their sores, and repented not of "their deeds."[b]

5. The revelation of the will of God. "This is life eter-"nal; that they might know thee the only true God, and "Jesus Christ whom thou has sent." "By his knowledge "[by the knowledge of him,] shall my righteous servant "justify many." "The law of the Lord is perfect, convert-"ing the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making "wise the simple: the statutes of the Lord are right, rejoic-"ing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, en-"lightening the eyes." "Wherewithal shall a young man "cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto, according to "thy word." "From a child, thou hast known the Holy "Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salva-"tion, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scrip-"ture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for "doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in "righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, tho-"roughly furnished unto all good works." "Behold the days

b Rom. viii. 28. Ps. lxxiii. 3—9. Isa. viii. 21. Rev. xvi. 9—11.

"come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in "the land; not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, "but of hearing the words of the Lord: and they shall wan- "der from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east, "they shall run to and fro, to seek the word of the Lord, "and shall not find it." "And the word of the Lord was "precious in those days; there was no open vision." "Where there is no vision the people perish; but he that "keepeth the law, happy is he"[a] These authorities shew that in the salvation of sinners, the scriptures are an important and necessary means, of which many are left destitute in divine sovereignty, and without which, divine justice permits many to perish.

6. The subjection of the heart to the law of Christ. "Kiss "the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, "when his wrath is kindled but a little." "Except ye re- "pent, ye shall all likewise perish." "Except a man be "born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "He that "believeth not is condemned already"—shall be condemned at the day of judgment;—and "shall go away into everlasting punishment." In relation to this subject we might quote all that the Scriptures say of the necessity of regeneration, repentance, and faith; justification, adoption and sanctification. Yet how many are there, who, instead of receiving Christ's yoke which is easy, and his burthen which is light, have "sent a message after him, saying, we will not "have this man to reign over us!" how many still retain that temper "which is not subject to the law of God neither "indeed can be!" Concerning every such character, the Judge has declared that he "will appoint him his portion "among unbelievers."[b]

It will be observed that the above six particulars all converge in the cross of Christ. "Neither is there salvation in "any other: for there is none other name under heaven "given among men, whereby we must be saved."[c] The love of God sent a Saviour, who willingly undertook the mediatorial work. The Spirit and Providence and word of God present and convey a Saviour; and, blessed be God, the hearts of his people, through grace, receive a Saviour. That there are many who forever reject this salvation, cannot rea-

---

a John xvii. 3. Isa. liii. 11. Ps. xix. 7. 8. 11. ix. 9. 2 Tim. iii. 15—17. Amos viii. 11. 12. 1 Sam. iii. 1. Prov. xxix. 18.

b Ps. ii. 12. Luke xiii. 3. John iii. 3. 18. Matt. xxv. 41. 46. Luke xix. 14. Rom. viii. 7. Luke xii. 46.

c Acts iv. 12.

sonably be denied, and is in fact admitted by Winchester himself. Their salvation then is an effect without a cause. They have no interest in the love of God, which is the procuring cause of salvation;—in the mediation of Christ, which is the meritorious cause;—in the grace of his Spirit which is the efficacious cause;—no improvement under his providence, which is the accidental cause;—nor under his word, which is the instrumental cause on the part of God; nor do they exercise that saving faith, out of a new heart, which is the instrumental cause on the part of man.[a] Now, according to the Scriptures, these are the only possible causes of salvation.—But there are confessedly some on whom they do not, and never shall operate. Therefore, there are some who never shall enjoy that salvation which is the effect of these causes.

It was asserted above, that Mr. Winchester admits the minor proposition of the syllogism just now repeated; that there are many, who forever reject this salvation. This was said on the authority of the Rev. Elisha Andrews,[b] who quotes from his works the following words, viz. "They who lived "and died in rebellion against God, will be eternally depri-"ved of the glories and honours of the kingdom of Christ." As he advocated a limited punishment in the future world, it is his well-known sentiment that some *have lived and died in rebellion against God*, and "will be condemned in the day of judgment, and punished in the lake of fire."[c] To the same amount Mr. Andrews[d] quotes another passage from Mr. Winchester, in the following words, viz. "The sin against "the Holy Ghost is an offence of that kind, that, either owing "to its uncommon malignity, as is most likely, or some other "cause, exposes the guilty person to the age of judgment from "which he cannot escape by repentance, pardon, and sprink-"ling of the blood of Christ, as other sinners may." Thus does Mr. Winchester admit that there are some sinners who are "eternally deprived of the glories and honors of the "kingdom of Christ" and "cannot escape by repentance, "pardon, and sprinkling of the blood of Christ." Those who believe that there is no salvation in any other,[e] will conclude that these sinners can never be saved.

Mr. Winchester has generally passed himself off for a firm

---

a See Lampe's Philologico-theological Dissertation on the Eternity of Punishments. Part 1. Section 31.

b See his Candid Examination of the Moral Tendency of the Doctrine of Universal Salvation, as taught by its advocates, p. 78.

c Dialogue 5th. d p. 77. e Acts 4: 12.

believer in the divinity and atonement of Christ. Unless these professions were swelling words of vanity, he must have considered him not only the Saviour of minor offenders, but of the most desperate transgressors that shall ever see heaven. Yet how different is the representation given in the above extracts! Does he believe that some who are saved, shall nevertheless be "*eternally deprived of the glories* "*and honors of the kingdom of Christ*?" Is it because Christ will frown upon any of his own purchase? No; but because their sins are of such "*uncommon malignity*" that they "*cannot escape by repentance, pardon, and sprinkling of the* "*blood of Christ.*" He would have us believe that there are sins of too deep a dye to be washed away in that blood "that speaketh better things than that of Abel." He would persuade us that Christ, whom God, hath "exalted with his "right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repen- "tance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins," cannot impart "repentance and pardon" to such gross offenders. They must therefore perish forever, or find a Saviour whose blood *can* cleanse them from sins of such "uncommon malignity." Who this transcendant Saviour is, will appear from the following extract from the same author, and through the same channel[a] viz. "As they have lived and died in sin, their "destruction or misery is certain, and there is no remedy "that can prevent their experiencing the *consequences* of their "crimes, and suffering the *just punishment* which shall be "inflicted upon them, according to their *different deserts.*" From the pen of a christian, this language would evidently convey the doctrine of eternal punishment. This was far from Mr. Winchester's meaning. He is here speaking of persons whom he vainly expects to reach heaven at last. Upon what ground? Because Christ suffered, *the just for the unjust*? No; *they cannot escape by the sprinkling of the blood of Christ*; this will not do for sins of such *uncommon malignity*! How then would Mr. Winchester save them? He would have them save themselves, by meeting the demands of the law in their own persons, and "suffering the "just punishment which shall be inflicted upon them, accor- "ding to their different deserts." One would suppose that it is not now difficult to tell what Mr. Winchester means by saying that such a man will be eternally deprived of the glories of Christ's kingdom. Would that man who, after committing crimes of uncommon malignity, had, in his own per-

a Andrews p. 74.

son, breasted the storm of divine vengeance, and made full satisfaction to the law of God, without any need of repentance, pardon, or vicarious sufferings;——would that man be satisfied with the glory of a Saviour whose blood was inadequate to an atonement which he had effected in his own person? Is it not easy to see that he would assume as great a pre-eminence over the church and its Divine Head in the other world, as such characters generally do in this world? Such is the profane contempt which Universalism, even in the hands of this *specious impostor*, throws upon the *only Redeemer* of lost sinners.

III. The several attributes of God, such as his justice and righteousness, holiness and truth. On these subjects I shall give plain scripture authority, which goes to shew that these attributes of God require the *punishment*; and the *eternal punishment* of the wicked. "And they cried with a loud "voice, saying, how long, O Lord HOLY and TRUE! dost "thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell "on the earth?" "And the third angel poured out his vial "upon the rivers and fountains of water, and they became "blood. And I heard the angel of the waters say, thou art "RIGHTEOUS, O Lord! which art and wast and shalt be, "because thou hast judged thus. For they have shed the "blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them "blood to drink; for they are *worthy*." "And after these "things, I heard a great voice of much people in heaven, say-"ing, Alleluia! Salvation, and glory, and honor, and power "unto the Lord our God: for TRUE and RIGHTEOUS are his "*judgments*: for he hath *judged* the great whore, which did "corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged "the blood of his servants at her hand. And again they said, "Alleluia! and her smoke rose up *for ever and ever*." "See-"ing it is a RIGHTEOUS thing with God, to recompense tri-"bulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are "troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be re-"vealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, "taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that "obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall "be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence "of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he "shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired "in all them that believe, (because our testimony among you "was believed,) in that day." [a]

---

[a] Rev. 6; 10. 16; 4—6. 19; 1—3. 2 Thess. 1; 6—10.

In these passages God is said to *judge* the wicked,—his decisions are called *judgments*;——they are said to be pronounced *in that day, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels*;——the punishment is *everlasting* even *forever and ever*;—it is inflicted because the wicked are *worthy* according to the strict principles of justice;—because it is a *righteous* thing with God to recompense tribulation to them;—because God is the "*Lord Holy and* "*True*," and "*True and Righteous are his judgments.*" These authorities shew that divine *justice* and *truth* require the everlasting punishment of the wicked, and that their be-being imprisoned until they pay the uttermost farthing of their debt, in a confinement to an absolute eternity. They prove that those who have vainly depended on their own sufferings to make satisfaction to justice, will be awfully disappointed; and it has already been shown in the two foregoing heads, that it will be then too late to escape through the vicarious satisfaction of Christ.

But there is another way of trying to evade the force of this argument. Lampe, in his "Dissertation on the Eternity of "Punishments,"[a] tells us of certain characters "who admit "that God has threatened those punishments in his word, "although, as Supreme Legislator, he is at liberty to dis-"pense with the execution, and to grant some mitigation, "though unknown to us. That there were some, even in "Chrysostom's time, who held this sentiment, I gather from "his Homily on the resurrection. 'How,' says he, 'shall I "persuade you? When I say their worm shall not die, their "fire shall not be quenched; when I say they shall go "into eternal fire; when I set before you the rich voluptua-"ry now wailing in the flames, you say, *these are only threats.* "This is the satanical doctrine[b] which renders the grace "given to you useless, and makes you unfruitful.' Of the "same stamp were those of whom Augustine, in his City of "God, 21: 24, says, 'This holds good against those, who in "pleading their own cause, attempt, under pretence of great-"er compassion, to contravene the words of God, asserting "*that* they are true only in as far as they shew what men *deserve* "to suffer, not what they actually *shall* suffer.'" To come nearer home, Dr. Huntingdon has adopted the same mode of interpretation, in the following words, viz. "That the wis-"dom of God saw fit, for a time, to leave man in such ignor-

a Part 2 Sect. 3.

b Satanicum hoc est verbum.

"rance and darkness of mind, that he should mistake that "which was spoken only as the voice of justice, for a decla-"ration of very fact." If our interpretation be a *mistake*, as he here represents it, then the scriptures do not *really* threaten eternal punishment, but only *appear* to do it, on account of our "ignorance and darkness of mind." What shall we think then, when Dr. Huntingdon himself confesses that this is no vain appearance, but a solid reality. The following question and answer are in his own words; viz. "Now "does the bible plainly say, that sinners of mankind shall be "damned to interminable punishment? It certainly does, "as plainly as language can express, or any man, or even "God himself can speak."[a] His assertion therefore, that God will not execute a threat which he has made, "as plain-"ly as language can express," is a denial of his truth; is a contravention of the words of God, as Augustine represents it, and of course, a satanical doctrine, as Chrysostom calls it. It deserves, to be classed with those rules of interpretation by which they first assert that the language is parabolical, or popular, and then conclude that it is false.

Among the many cases which are cited against the veracity of heaven, we need mention only two which appear to be chiefly relied upon. The first is in Gen. ii: 17. "But of "the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat "of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt "surely die." The second is in Jonah iii. 4, "And Jonah "began to enter into the city a day's journey, and he cried "and said, yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown." These threatenings, it is declared, never were executed, and never will be, either in the actual transgressors, or their Substitute or Surety. "The argument," says Lampe[b] "upon "which they chiefly rest their opinion, is this; that threat-"enings do not produce the same obligation which promises "do: since he who threatens, assumes the character of a cre-"ditor, whilst he against whom the threat is denounced, be-"comes a debtor. On the contrary, he who promises be-"comes a debtor to him to whom the promise is made. Now "it is perfectly competent to a creditor to remit a debt, "whereas a debtor is bound to all that he has promised." This theory has at least, as much evidence in Revelation, as the vortices of Cartesius have in nature. It is a profane figment, invented to account for that which was not under-

a Andrews pp. 32, 33.
b Part 2d, Sect. 8.

stood: and it, doubtless came from the same stupid irreverence, which has so often charged the Almighty with neglecting to fulfil his promises, as well as his menaces. "There "shall come in the last days scoffers walking after their own "lusts, and saying, where is *the promise* of his coming?" For charging God with a breach of *promise*, he made the Israelites wander forty years in the wilderness.[a]

The Bible says that God "doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve "the children of men:"[b] yet, according to the above theory, all the sufferings of the creation in time and eternity are inflicted, not because the honour of God requires the execution of justice, but because he afflicts willingly and gratuitously. The distinguishing love of Christ, in taking upon him our nature, instead of the nature of fallen angels, is highly celebrated in the Scriptures: yet, according to this theory, his sufferings were unnecessary, as there was nothing in divine truth and justice, to hinder the salvation of men and devils without a Mediator.

But what saith the scripture about the faithfulness of God in the execution of his threatenings? "Hear this word that "the Lord hath spoken against you, O Children of Israel! "against the whole family which I brought up from the land "of Egypt, saying, you only have I known of all the families "of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniqui-"ties." "As I live, saith the Lord, though Coniah, the son "of Jehoiakim, King of Judah were the signet upon my right "hand, yet would I pluck thee thence." "And also the "strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a "man that he should repent."[c] On the two first of these texts Winchester speaks well. Take a part of his remarks on the second. "Consider first, who speaks. Jehovah: He not "only speaks, but confirms his *threatening* with an oath; and "because he can swear by no greater, he swore by himself, "by his own life: 'As I live, saith, Jehovah, though Coniah, "the son of Jehoiakim, King of Judah;' though he is of the fami-"ly of David, with whom I have made an everlasting coven-"ant, ordered in all things, and sure; and though he is "anointed King over my people; I will not spare him: yea "though he 'were the signet upon my right hand, yet "would I pluck thee thence.'" In another place he says, "I as much believe as you or any other man can do, that all

a 2 Pet. iii. 3. 4. Num. xiv. 3. 34.
b Lam. iii. 33.
c Amos iii. 2. Jer. xxii. 24. 1 Sam. xv. 29.

"the threatenings will be fulfilled upon the finally impeni-
"tent."[a] Although Bishop Newton was an Universalist, he speaks on this subject in the following manner, viz. "If God "will not execute as well as threaten, why doth he threaten "at all? Is it not more suitable to the character of a God of "truth, and becoming the simplicity and sincerity of a divine "revelation, to declare the truth, and nothing but the truth, "and leave it to work upon men as it can, rather than de-"nounce, in the most solemn manner, what was never in-"tended, and what shall never come to pass; and so en-"deavour to alarm them with false fears, and to work upon "them with false persuasions, which have nothing to answer "them?"[b]

That the theory which we are opposing does impeach the veracity of the Almighty, as the Bishop here intimates, is evident from the third text quoted above, from 1 Sam. 15: 29. In the preceding verse, the prophet Samuel said to king Saul, "The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee "this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine that is "better than thou." Although this, like other predictions, is given in an historical form, it is evidently *a threat.* Saul repented not of sin, but, as he had seen much of the forbearance of the God of Israel, he was tempted to hope that he would repent of his threatening, after the manner of earthly parents, who, through a sinful infirmity, neglect to inflict a threatened punishment. Samuel, aware of this, intimates unequivocally, that such a suspicion would virtually give the lie to his Maker. He therefore adds in the very next words to the threatening, "And also the strength of Israel will not "lie nor repent: for he is not a man that he should repent."

What does the prophet mean by saying that God "is not a "man that he should repent?" Do not the scriptures frequently ascribe repentance to God? Yes, but not man's sort of repentance. When man repents of a threatening, or neglects to execute it, we may account for it on the ground of caprice, corruption by bribery, or conviction of error; on the ground of forgetfulness or fickliness, fear, favour or feebleness. But none of these causes can justly be attributed to that God who is infinitely wise and powerful, steadfast, holy and upright. He has no such pusillanimous fears, nor personal partialities as would move him to pass by sins for which there is no atonement. His is the repentance of God

a Dialogue 5th. Andrews p. 74.
b Andrews, p. 27.

and not of man. He never repents of his threatenings against the finally impenitent, and whenever a man repents of sin, God never fails to repent of his previous threats against him. "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, "and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, "and to destroy it; if that nation against whom I have pro-"nounced, turn from their evil, I will *repent* of the evil that "I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall "speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to "build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey "not my voice, then I will *repent* of the good, wherewith I "said I would benefit them."[a] These are the gospel principles, in the maintenance of which, Jeremiah threatened the house of Israel. To these principles Jonah yielded a reluctant accordance when threatening the Ninevites. "Was not "this my saying when I was yet in my country? Therefore "I fled before unto Tarshish; for I knew that thou art a gra-"cious God, and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kind-"ness, and *repentest* thee of the evil."[b] From Jonah or from Jonah's God, the king of Nineveh had learned the same doctrine: for which reason he proclaimed a fast, and said "Let "man and beast be covered with sackcloth, and cry mightily "unto God: yea, let them turn every one from his evil way, "and from the violence that is in their hands. Who can tell "if God will turn and *repent*, and turn away from his fierce "anger, that we perish not."[c]

These passages are abundant evidence in the question whether the threatening against Nineveh was absolute or conditional. If Jonah believed it to be absolute, why did he complain of that grace and mercy through which God remits the threatened punishment on condition of repentance and faith? If the Ninevites considered it absolute, why did they repent and believe, with the express hope that on these conditions, God would "repent and turn away from his fierce "anger that we perish not?" If God intended it to be absolute, why did he publish, as an invariable rule of his universal government, that if a nation repented of the sin, he would repent of the evil? These things shew that the menace was really conditional; that it was so intended on the part of God, and that it was so understood by the prophet and those to whom he addressed it. They were to be destroyed in forty days unless they repented;—but they did repent;—there-

a Jer. 18: 7—10.
b Jonah 4: 2.
c Jonah 3; 8, 9.

fore the threat did not call for the immediate destruction of the identical offenders, but was accomplished without it.

Whether the same principle will apply to the threat against Adam for eating the forbidden fruit, need not now be discussed. "For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Suffice it to say, that if this threat, like that against Nineveh, left room for the interposition of the seed of the woman, and if Adam laid hold of this gracious plan of salvation, as did the Ninevites, then there was no call for his destruction. In such a case it was not the intention of the Almighty that the punishment should be inflicted upon the offending individual, but upon that Saviour whom his faith embraced. If, by a living faith, he did receive the promise offered to him directly after his fall, then he was immediately justified; and in receiving forgiveness through faith, his sins were transferred by imputation to "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world;"[a] in whom he died vicariously, as Isaac is said to have died and arisen again figuratively, in the ram which God sent to die in his place, as a type of his divine Surety.[b]

But even supposing that Adam did not receive the offered mercy, does the language of the threat necessarily imply that he should expire within twenty-four hours of his transgression? Let it be remembered that this whole theory rests upon a restricted, and I might say, arbitrary interpretation of a monographical Hebrew particle. But this particle which is here used in connexion with *day*, and translated "*in the day*," is; in Numb. xxviii. 26, used in connexion with *weeks*, and as correctly translated, "*after the weeks*."[c] Even if the threat had been executed a thousand years *after* that day instead of *in* that very day, the Apostle has told us that "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." This declaration is made by Peter for the very same purpose for which it is quoted here; to prove that "the Lord is not slack concerning his promise as some men count slackness."[d]

The truth is that the prophetic Scriptures often, if not usually, speak of a thing as being done on the day in which a decree is published that it shall be done. Of this description is

a Rev. xiii. 8.
b Hebr. xi. 19.
c This fact, though mentioned by Parkhurst, never occurred to me, until suggested by a Physician of this place, to whose kindness I am much indebted, in common with many of my Ministerial brethren.
d 2 Pet. iii. 8. 9.

that threatening which Samuel uttered against Saul, when he so forcibly assured him of the divine veracity in the execution of his menaces. "The Lord *hath rent* the kingdom of Israel "from thee THIS DAY, and *hath given* it to a neighbour of "thine that is better than thou." In respect of the date this threat is as express as that against Adam. The stripling who slew Goliah had not yet left his father's flocks. According to the theory now before us, the transfer of the kingdom from Saul to David is to take place *this day*, or the threatening is not fulfilled at all. Was this the meaning of Samuel? or did Saul understand it thus? Both of them proceed as if they considered it only the declaration of a decree which was as certainly to be accomplished hereafter, as if it had already been fulfilled on *this day*. Why is Christ called "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," when, in fact, he was not literally slain until four thousand years after? Because the eternal decree of God, which contemplated this sacrifice, was published to Adam, in the promise of the seed of the woman to bruise the serpent's head; and because Adam commenced immediately to make believing draughts upon those resources of grace which, according to the purpose of God were "given us in Christ Jesus before the world began."[a] In Paul's discourse to the people of Antioch,[b] he shewed that David in Ps. ii. 7, spoke of the resurrection of Christ. "I "will declare the decree: The Lord hath said unto me, Thou "art my Son; *this day* have I begotten thee." Although the Son of God was mysteriously and incomprehensibly begotten of the Father from all eternity (for there can be no Father without a Son[c]) yet was the body of Christ literally raised from the dead on *this day*, even the day on which David wrote? No: but the prophet declared the decree on *this day*; and this made his resurrection as certain as if it had already occurred; since it was the promise of that "God who quickeneth the "dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they "were."[d] But if HE who is the author of language and the judge of language, has chosen, in infinite sovereignty, to adopt such a style of prophecy, as declares the death and resurrection of the second Adam to be already past, thousands of years before they come to pass, is it any wonder that he should speak of the death of the first Adam, as taking place hundreds of years before he expired? If, in the true, consistent, and intelligible language of prophecy, he declared that

a 2 Tim. i. 9.
b Acts xiii. 33.
c Hebr. i. 8.
d Rom iv. 17.

David a type of Christ, had supplanted Saul, a type of Satan, on the very day of Saul's transgression, shall we impeach his veracity, when he declares that Adam shall die on the day of his transgression? If he who is seized with a mortal disease, or capitally condemned by the civil court, may say with truth, "I am a dead man," how much more emphatically may this be said of one against whom the sentence of heaven is past, and whose soul and body are seized with the leprosy of sin and mortality!

If therefore, the threat against Adam subjected him to disease and mortality, which is an inceptive death;—if it was pronounced in prophetic language which speaks of things in distant futurity as already past, and speaks of the publication of a decree as its substantial accomplishment;—if moreover, it was conditional, and that death which he afterward suffered was sent as a gracious blessing, instead of a legal curse;—then we say that the threat was executed in that sense in which it was intended to be performed, and according to the true import of language: wherefore, it was not only uttered as a measure of divine justice, but executed as an evidence of divine veracity.

When God pronounced the sentence of death upon Adam and the Ninevites, and when he says concerning all men, "the soul that sinneth, it shall die,"[a] how can these threats be truly considered a measure of divine justice, without being executed? Justice is a distribution of rewards and punishments, according to our deserts. According to justice, sin must be punished wherever it is found, and no being must be punished without sin. As it would be unjust to punish one who had no guilt, either personal or imputed, so would it be unjust to permit any sin of any responsible being to escape, without its legal measure of punishment, either in the individual offender or an adequate substitute. That the plan of redemption is not only a glorious illustration of divine grace and mercy, but an equally glorious vindication of divine truth and justice, is manifest from the whole word of God, and sometimes most conspicuously from those passages which are obtrusively urged against this doctrine. In the case of the Ninevites we do not find Jonah dreading their forgiveness under an apprehension that God was deficient in truth or justice, but he says "I knew that thou art a gracious "God and merciful." In the case of Adam we find that

a Ezek. 18: 4.

mercy and grace are revealed through the Seed of the woman. From a later writer we learn that this seed of the woman "is the end of the law for righteousness to every one "that believeth." [a] *The end of the law*! For what end was the law made? For obedience or disobedience? If the former then Christ, in becoming the end of the law, obeyed the law. Was the law made for the end that it might be prostrated, or that it might be satisfied? If Christ fulfilled all righteousness; if he magnified the law and made it honorable, [b] then, in becoming the end of the law, he satisfied all its demands preceptive and penal. This he did for the forensic justification of believers; for he became the end of the law *for righteousness*, (or justification,) to every one that believeth," whether in the time of Adam or Jonah, or John the Baptist or John Wickliffe; "For all have, sinned and come "short of the glory of God; being *justified* freely, by his "grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom "God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his "blood." As this redemption or propitiation was effected long after the time of these ancient transgressors, one might be tempted to question the righteousness of the most High, in the remission of these sins which were committed so long ago, and passed by with impunity by the forbearance of God. How can you at this time, vindicate the righteousness of God in this procedure? How can he be just, and the justifier of sinners who lived and died before the atonement was made? The very next words of the Apostle, to those last quoted, are an answer to these enquiries. He represents God as setting forth this propitiation, not to relax his righteousness, or to show how he can justify a sinner contrary to his justice; but "to declare his *righteousness* for the remission of sins that "are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I "say, at this time, his *righteousness*; that he might be *just*, "and the *justifier* of him which believeth in Jesus." Now that the claims of the law are perfectly satisfied, through his one offering, in behalf of all believers in every age of the world, God's faithfulness and justice, which doom the impenitent to hell, require the *salvation*, of those who like the Ninevites, embrace the atonement. "If we confess our sins, "he is *faithful* and *just* to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse "us from all unrighteousness." [d]

---

a Rom. 10; 4.
b Matt. iii. 15. Isa. xlii. 21.
c Rom. iii. 23—26.
d 1 John i. 9.

Before my remarks on the divine perfections, as they have a bearing upon future punishment, are brought to a close, it is right to take some notice of that incongruity which the enemies of God think that they see between his severer and milder attributes. How, they say, can he be merciful, if he must satisfy his justice by the infliction of punishments which we would suppose cruel in the extreme? Can he who requires the condign punishment of every sin, either in the offender or his substitute, be said to exercise any grace or forgiveness at all? and can that heart be ineffably tender, which can voluntarily witness the most excruciating anguish in his fallen creatures to all eternity? Such objectors think that it is impossible for God to be *just*, and at the same time the merciful and forgiving *justifier* of the believer; although the scriptures assure us that the reconciliation of these two things, in the salvation of sinners, was the reason why Jesus Christ was set forth as a propitiation.

If it would derogate from the mercy of God to inflict the threatened punishment upon Adam, what shall we say of the fact that through his sin, the whole world is brought into a a state of sin and misery? "For the creature was made "subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who "hath subjected the same in hope." What shall we say of the fact that, on account of this general and involuntary subjection to vanity, through Adam, "the whole creation groan-"eth and travaileth in pain together until now?"[a] This takes place under the sovereign superintendance and the omniscient inspection of that God who is infinitely merciful as well as infinitely just. He is a voluntary witness of the cries of nascent infancy, the agonies of mature vigour, and the groans of expiring age. In the appropriate exercise of infinite tenderness of heart, he beholds his rebellious creatures in every country, and in every period of their protracted history, writhing under the pressure of sickness and sin, penury and persecution. He commissions his angels to destroy them; and his own providence sends the sword and pestilence, hurricane and earthquake, fire, flood and famine, to sweep millions from a life of suffering here, to fiercer and more enduring pains in another world: yet these terrible things in righteousness are consistent with infinite mercy.

Even in the same human bosom we sometimes find such a mixture of mercy and justice,—of lovely softness, and awful sternness, as excites the admiration of mankind. Of this we

a Rom. viii. 20, 22.

have a memorable example in the conduct of one whose name is dear to every American, and who was no less conspicuous for his love of peace, than for his skill in war. You all recollect that, under Providence, a single word from Washington could once have saved the life of Major Andre. Without detracting from the female character, it may be said with truth, that not a bosom among my fair audience, glows with more tender and unfeigned pity for suffering humanity, than did the breast of Washington. Yet justice steeled his heart against the united importunities of two contending nations. The law condemns the prisoner to death. The vital interests of our country demand the execution of the righteous sentence. But can no mitigation be allowed? Remember that it was not personal or political animosity, but professional enthusiasm that brought him to our shores. He traversed the ocean to heal a wounded heart, and seek for glory in a foreign land. Whether he shall die the most disgraceful death, or die at all, is now to be decided. The General's feelings, needing no excitement, have already been excited by numerous written petitions. At last the youthful, blooming, smiling, accomplished soldier stands before him. His person and his manners kindle the admiring eyes of myriads of spectators. Touched with the history of his life and his impending death, they turn their supplicating looks toward the arbiter of his fate. Compassion revelled in his bosom, glistened in his eye, and bedewed his manly cheek. But justice was enthroned in his inmost soul: and although the waves of popular desire added force to the flood of his own paternal feelings, they dashed against a rock which hid its summit in the clouds, and its base in the centre of the earth. He pitied but he pardoned not.

Hear what the God of justice and mercy says concerning impenitent convicts. "I will not pity, nor spare, nor have mercy, but destroy them;"[a] or as the margin reads, "nor have mercy from destroying them;" that is, *pity shall not make me spare them, nor mercy keep me from destroying them,* "But is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no Physician there?" "Let Israel hope in the Lord: for with the Lord there is mercy, and with him is plenteous redemption." Every believer is "justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." "In him mercy and truth are met together: righteousness and peace have kissed each other."[b]

a Jer. xiii. 14. Lam. ii. 2. Zech. xi. 6.
b Jer. viii. 22. Ps. cxxx. 7. Rom. iii. 24. Ps. lxxxv. 10.

Without this interposition of the Son of God to procure mercy for us, by satisfying justice for us, sinners never could have been saved in consistency with the divine attributes, and, therefore, never could have been saved at all. And so far is this plan from not deserving the name of *mercy* or *grace*, because justice is satisfied, this is the very consideration which enhances the lustre of these perfections beyond all conception. To forgive at the expense of purity or veracity, claims not our admiration; to save without a sacrifice is cheap and easy, and claims comparatively little gratitude. But when God's justice, which is essential to his nature, required that the sins of his enemies should be fully punished either in their own persons, or in his eternal Son, the only adequate substitute which the universe afforded; his interposition with such a sacrifice, may well excite the admiration of angels, and the contrition and eternal gratitude of all his blood-bought people. The sweetest ingredient in the glorious cup of salvation, is, that when immutable justice called for our destruction, "God so loved "the world, that he gave his only begotten Son [the just for "the unjust] that whosoever believeth in him should not "perish but have everlasting life."[a]

IV. In connexion with the severer attributes of God, it was proposed to infer the doctrine of eternal punishment from the scriptural account of sin. It is not my intention here to discuss the question, whether there is or is not an infinite evil in every sin. You may easily conjecture my reason for omitting an argument which has been deemed of so much importance in this controversy, by President Edwards, Dr. Wylie, and other excellent writers. My remarks might possibly be adopted with equal ease by them, and by their brethren who deny that absolute infinity belongs to a creature or any of his actions; and who believe that there is as much of an objective infinity in obedience as in disobedience. As the best men that have ever lived, inspired or uninspired, have had reason to pray that God would convince them of secret faults, it is probable that none but the infinite mind can ever see the least sin of the least sinner, in the extent of its turpitude.

But let us see how universalism represents this greatest of all evils. My opponent speaks in the following language, viz. "As the diseases of the body are mere privations, of "health, so the disorders of the mind are all *merely negative*,

a John iii. 16. 1 Pet. iii. 18.

"a lack or want of their contrary virtues; the same as dark-
"ness is nothing more than the absence or want of light.
"Hence ignorance, folly, injustice, hatred, cruelty, &c. are
"only the want of knowledge, wisdom, justice, love, mercy,
"&c. and therefore these are the sovereign remedies for the
"mind. Yea, all the remedies for the moral maladies and
"vices of the human heart, are to be sought for in their con-
"trary virtues."[a] Take notice, he declares that all sin is *negative;* and not only so, but it is "*merely* negative;" that is, there is nothing positive about it: and he applies this remark to such sins as "injustice, hatred, cruelty, &c." Now is it true that a man may lie, and cheat his neighbour and pollute his family and incur no positive guilt? Is there nothing more than a *mere negation* in swearing, gaming, sabbath-breaking, and intemperance? Does my opponent give this view of sin when he is speaking of the real or supposed offences of orthodox christians? What is it that gives such exquisite interest to the case of St. Augustine and his paramour, the case of John Knox and Cardinal Beatoun, and especially that of Calvin and Servetus? At the very mention of these subjects in an heretical circle, animation fills every heart, and eloquence moves every tongue. Every toad in the company thinks himself a pattern of purity and a giant of greatness. When they turn the conversation from characters of such transcendant talents, piety and usefulness, and contemplate the *real* faults of inferior men, their criminal code is revised and corrected; sin is not quite so odious: and by the time they are at the bottom of the scale, among Universalists and Unitarians, Atheists and Libertines, sin becomes a *mere negation.* In a character of this description, deliberate murder would only be a want of love! "Fools
"make a mock at sin:"[b] and the necessary tendency of universalism towards this folly, shows its opposition to the Bible.

In that sacred volume we are taught that sin banished angels of light into eternal darkness. It was sin which removed Adam from the happy garden, and brought misery and death upon all his race. It was sin which destroyed the old world by water, and the fertile plain of Sodom by fire and brimstone. On account of sin, these elements shall melt with fervent heat; and for sin, he who made the world, and wields these elements, was made a whole burnt offering.
"Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down
"his life for us."[c] So odious is sin that it must be fully pun-

a Lectures, p. 195. b Prov. xiv. 9. c 1 John, iii. 16.

ished even when found imputed to the Holy Jesus. So hateful is it, beyond a parallel, that the Apostle, for the want of a worse description, called sin "exceeding sinful,"[a] because there was nothing else as bad as itself. The purity of heaven cannot receive it; for "there shall in no wise enter "into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh "abomination, or maketh a lie, but they which are written "in the Lamb's book of life."[b] The holiness of God cannot bear it. "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and "canst not look on iniquity."[c] He requires holiness in all his glorified subjects. "Follow peace with all men, and "holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord."[d] His justice requires the punishment even of those sins which are committed while undergoing the punishment of former offences. "Every transgression and disobedience receiveth a "*just* recompense of reward."[e] Thus does the scriptural account of sin, in connexion with the inspired account of God's holiness and justice, infer the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent.

V. We infer the same doctrine from what the Bible says of the helplessness of sinners. Here I shall undertake to speak but little of a distinction which some affect between natural and moral inability, whereby they would prove that a man who can do *nothing* without Christ, can do *every thing* without him. My sentiments on this subject, are those of the reformation; those which Luther advocated in opposition to Erasmus; those which the Westminster Assembly adopted; those which the Presbyterians of Scotland and America have received; those which the General Assembly of our church have ratified by a judicial decision; and those which are found in the oracles of God. I believe sincerely, as I professed to believe, when consenting to the Confession of Faith in my ordination, that "man, by his fall into a state "of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual "good accompanying salvation: so as a natural man being "altogether averse from that which is good, and dead in sin, "is not able by his own strength, to convert himself, or to "prepare himself thereunto;" that sinners "are utterly in-"disposed, disabled and made opposite to all good, and whol-"ly inclined to all evil;" that "their ability to do good

a Rom. vii. 13.
b Rev. xxi. 27.
c Habb. i. 13.
d Heb. xii. 14.
e Heb. ii. 2.

"works is not at all of themselves, but wholly from the Spi-
"rit of Christ."[a]

These declarations describe our condition in a state of nature, while unconnected with an Almighty Redeemer; and let it be remembered that Mr. Winchester admits that some are "eternally deprived of the glories and honours of the "kingdom of Christ." According to the Scriptures, some of these characters owe five hundred pence, and others fifty, and they have "nothing to pay." Joshua says, "ye *cannot serve the Lord.*" Our Saviour says, "Without me ye *can do nothing.*" Paul says, "the carnal mind is enmity against God; "for it is not subject to the law of God, *neither indeed can be.* "So then, they that are in the flesh *cannot please God.*" "Strive to enter in at the strait gate; for many, I say unto you, shall strive to enter in, and *shall not be able.*" "Then "said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall "seek me, and shall die in your sins. Whither I go, *ye can-* "*not come.*" "For the grave *cannot praise thee*, death *can-* "*not celebrate thee.* They that go down into the pit, *cannot* "*hope for thy truth.*" Thus there are many who are without Christ forever;—But without Christ they have nothing to pay their debt; they can do nothing; they cannot serve God; they cannot submit to his law; they cannot please him by faith in his gospel, for ("without faith it is impossible to please him;") they are not able to enter in at the strait gate; they cannot come to him in Heaven; they cannot hope in him when dying, nor praise nor celebrate him among the redeemed beyond the grave.—If they can do none of these things, can they be saved? Blessed be Jehovah, God of Israel, that "when we were yet without strength, in due time, Christ died for the ungodly;" that, when we were helpless, God "laid help upon One that is Mighty;" and that although Christ has said "*no man can come to me*, except the Father which hath sent me draw him," yet he has also said, "all that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out." Although, as a punishment of sin, we are justly doomed to spiritual death, a state of powerless corruption and misery, yet it is promised, "thy people shall be willing in the day of *thy power.*" As *ours* is a guilty helplessness, it does not release us from the obligations of the law or of the gospel, the spirit says, "work out your salvation with fear and trembling:" and to encourage sinners to look for divine assistance, it is added, "for it

[a] Confession of Faith, chap. 9. sect. 3. Chap. 6, sect. 3. Chap. 16. sect. 3.

is God which worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure."[a]

VI. In connexion with the helpless condition of sinners, we proposed inferring the doctrine of their eternal punishment, from the character, influence, and dominion of that society to which the curse has exposed and subjected them. It is a very plain, though involuntary acknowledgment of the strength of this argument, when universalists, in order to elude its force, deny the very existence of fallen angels. This is evidently done through the suggestion of the devil, and to serve his purposes. When an army approaches unobserved, within cannon shot of our camp, while we believe that they are not in existence, this is as they would have it: and that traitor who had lulled us into this fatal repose, in opposition to many faithful warnings, would be considered their humble servant. When this deceit of satan and his servants takes effect, it is no wonder that sinners are "taken "captive by him at his will." "When any one heareth the "word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then "cometh the wicked one and catcheth away that which was "sown in his heart." "The tares are the children of the "wicked one. The enemy that soweth them is the devil." "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost; in "whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of "them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel "of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." "He that committeth sin is of the devil, for the devil sinneth "from the beginning." "Ye do the deeds of your father." "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father "ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and "abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is "a liar and the father of it." "O full of all subtlety "and all mischief: thou child of the devil! thou ene-"my of all righteousness! wilt thou not cease to pervert "the right ways of the Lord?" "If I, with the finger of "God, cast out devils, no doubt, the kingdom of God is come "upon you. When a strong man armed, keepeth his palace, "his goods are in peace: but when a stronger than he shall "come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him

---

a Matt. xviii, 24. Luke vii, 41, 42. John xv, 5. Josh. xxiv, 19. Rom. viii, 7, 8. Heb. xi, 6. Luke xiii, 24. John viii, 21. Isa. xxxviii, 18. Rom. 5, 6. Ps. lxxxix, 19. John vi, 44, 37. Ps. cx, 3. Phil. ii, 12, 13.

all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils."[a] Although the Divine Saviour, this stronger man, has delivered many captives, there are still many, who, according to Mr. Winchester's own acknowledgment, "will be eternally deprived of the glories and honours of the kingdom of Christ." According to the above Scriptures, the devil is a strong man, and these *lost* and *blinded* sinners are his captives; the devil is a father, and they are his children. As might be expected, they resemble each other. He perverted the right ways of the Lord, and so do they; he is a sinner, an enemy of all righteousness, a liar and a murderer, and so are they. As Christ is the only deliverer, and as these sinners have, to their own eternal destruction, renounced any dependance upon him, they must continue forever, under the instruction and example, dominion and oppression, of this more than Egyptian tyrant. An aggravation of their hopeless case is, that they must still continue to be rational and responsible beings. Their corruption and guilt must forever increase, and consequently, to all eternity, the cloud of vengeance must thicken over them, and the pit of their suffering shall be without bottom.

SECOND ORTHODOX ARGUMENT.

IMPLICATION.

This argument is inexhaustible: for every commandment of the law implies a sanction; every promise of the gospel implies a threat against gospel despisers; and every expression of approbation to those who repent, believe, or obey, who are justified, adopted, or sanctified, implies the condemnation of the contrary character. A few passages of Scripture, which come under the form of insinuation, supposition, and interrogation, shall serve as specimens of implication.

1. *Insinuation.* Is not our Saviour's declaration against hypocrites, that "they have their reward," an insinuation that they have only a temporal reward? Is not the Psalmist's declaration concerning "men of the world, who have "their portion in this life," an insinuation that they have no portion in another life? When the Apostle Paul said "godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the "life that now is, and of that which is to come," did he not insinuate that the ungodly were without the blessing of heaven here and hereafter? When our Saviour said, "he that

a 2 Tim. ii. 26. Matt. xiii 19, 38—43. 2 Cor. iv. 3, 4. 1 John iii. 8, 10. John viii 41 44. Acts. xiii. 10. Luke xi. 20—22.

"believeth on me hath everlasting life," and "he that be-
"lieveth on me shall never thrist," did he not insinuate that unbelievers shall have their portion in the lake of fire, which is the second death, and in which there is not a drop of water to quench their thrist? All these questions are plainly answered by a voice directed from heaven to an inhabitant of this lake. "But Abraham said, son, remember that thou in "thy life-time receivedst thy good things, and likewise La-"zarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art "tormented."

When our Saviour promises mercy and comfort, satisfaction and sanctification, a royal inheritance, and a heavenly reward, to the poor in spirit, the mourners, the meek and merciful, the pure, the persecuted, and the peace makers, is not an opposite destiny insinuated against opposite characters? When Peter says by the spirit of God, "he that fear-"eth him, and worketh righteousness is accepted with him," is it not an insinuation that the presumptuous and disobedient shall be rejected? When Paul says that the gospel "is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that belie-"veth," does he not insinuate that the gospel shall not save the unbeliever? When our Saviour says, "blessed is he, "whosoever shall not be offended in me," and "he that en-"dureth to the end shall be saved," is it not an insinuation that those who *are* offended with Christ, and turn back from following him, shall not be blessed or saved? In the doctrinal, experimental, and practical reception of christianity, there are many dangers to encounter, and many prejudices and corruptions to overcome. Our Saviour says, "to him "that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne." What does this insinuate concerning those who are led captive by the world, the flesh, and the devil?[a]

2. *Supposition.* Although all the passages advanced under this head, are hypothetical expressions, all of them, except the last, contain almost as manifest an innuendo as those which have been adduced above. "Behold I stand at "the door and knock: IF any man hear my voice, and open "the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him and "he with me." "IF any man therefore purge himself from "these, he shall be a vessel unto honor." These passages imply that those who are not cleansed, and who do not open the door, shall be banished from Christ, and treated with

a Matt. vi. 2, 16. Luke xvi. 25. Jn. vi. 47, 35. Rev. xx. 14. Ps. xvii. 14. Matt. v. 3—12. Acts. x. 35. Rev. iii. 21. Matt. xi. 6, 10: 22. Rom. i. 16.

contempt: and this is elsewhere called an "everlasting contempt." Concerning false teachers, our Saviour says, "IF "it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." Does not this imply that all others are fatally deceived? Paul says, "let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed LEST he fall." If none could fall, by mistaking the ground upon which he stood, why this caution? The same caution against resting in a form of godliness without the power, and thus falling short of real religion, is taught in the following passage. "Looking diligently, LEST any man fail of the grace "of God; LEST any root of bitterness springing up trou-"ble you, and thereby many be defiled; LEST there be any "fornicator or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel "of meat, sold his birth right." The sequel proves what is here implied; that these characters, like Esau, are rejected of God. "For if they escaped not who rejected him that "spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, IF we turn "away from Him that speaketh from Heaven."[a]

My last text, which I observed, did not contain an inuendo, may be considered as amounting to positive proof, although it contains a supposition. "The Son of man goeth, "as it is written of him; but woe unto that man by whom "the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man "IF he had not been born."[b]

On this passage my opponent, with great confidence, repeatedly challenges me to meet him. The following are his words, viz. "I am willing to take the person and character "of the traitor Judas, as the entire subject of the debate, to "decide the question under discussion; and if my opponent "can prove that Judas is to be eternally miserable, I admit "that he proves his doctrine; but if I prove from the testi-"mony of the inspired writers, that there is as much reason "to believe he will be saved, as there is to believe that any "of the other disciples will be saved, then he has lost the ar-"gument. If my opponent will not meet me on this, or on "any other argument, you, my hearers, will say it is because "he dare not." "I am not ashamed to appear before this "audience as the advocate for the final salvation of even "Judas, and if I am not able to prove that we have the same "reason for believing in his final and eternal happiness, as "we have to believe in the salvation of Peter or of Paul, I

a Rev. iii. 20. 2 Tim. ii. 21. Matt. xxiv. 24. 1 Cor. x. 12. 9. 27. Heb. xii. 15—17, 25. Jer. iv. 4. 17. 27. 21. 12. Am. 5. 6.
b Matt. xxvi. 24.

"must give up to my opponent, and acknowledge he has "gained his argument. I must have the same hope for the "salvation of Judas as I have for my own, or my faith in uni-"versal salvation is without foundation. Could I not prove "from the testimony of the scriptures that Judas is finally to "be saved, I tell you, my hearers, I could not so boldly ad-"vocate the doctrine of universal redemption; upon the sal-"vation of Judas, therefore, I rest the truth of my doctrine. "Judas, we acknowledge, was guilty, he was a traitor; but "show me the law which requires that he should be endless-"ly miserable, that is, punished to an absolute eternity for "what he did."[a]

In the above challenges, my opponent seems confident that Judas is as safe as any other Apostle, but at other times, he appears to think him much safer than one of them One would almost think that he was afraid of Peter's being lost, because he was so much more hard-hearted and impenitent than his beloved Judas. The following are his words, viz. "There is nothing in the whole history of Judas, that should "cause us to suppose he will never be saved. If salvation "be predicated on repentance, we have the same evidence, "yea, if possible, better evidence of the repentance of Judas, "than we have of the repentance of Peter. The one betrays "his master, the other denies him: but what does Judas "when he finds his master is in the hands of his enemies? "Does he, like Peter, cowardly deny him, with imprecations "and curses? No, he comes forward to the enemies of his "Lord, and declares that he had sinned in that he 'had be-"trayed innocent blood.' He acknowledges and repents of "his guilt, and bears honorable testimony to the innocence "of Jesus. But the priests, having obtained their end, in "the apprehension of our Lord, care not for this confession, "but they say, 'What is that to us? See thou to that.' Does "Judas rest contented, saying, well, I have got the money, "and what I have done cannot now be undone? No, he des-"pises his ill-gotten gain; 'he cast down the pieces of sil-"ver' at the feet of the priests, and went out, and 'was suf-"focated with grief.' I know that our common version of "the scriptures, says, 'he went and hanged himself;' but "it is the part of my opponent to prove that this is the mean-"ing of the original, which he cannot do. How is the idea "of his having hanged himself reconcileable with the account "given in the book of Acts, of the death of Judas? 'Fall-

a Minutes, p. p. 77, 90.

"ing headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his "bowels gushed out.' Acts i. 13. The learned Mr. Wake-"field, who was no Universalist, translates the passage, "'Then he threw down the pieces of silver in the temple, "and withdrew: and after his departure, was choaked with "anguish:' and that excessive grief will produce this effect, "all who know any thing of the effects of the passions on "the body, must acknowledge. I would now ask, have we "as much evidence of the sincerity of the repentance of those "who come forward in our days, and declare themselves to "be such great sinners in the sight of God and man? Do "they make restitution in those instances in which they have "injured their brother? I do sincerely wish that we had the "same evidence of the sincere repentance of christians, in "our day, as we have of the sincerity of Judas, when 'he re-"pented him, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver "to the chief priests and elders.' Matt. xxvii. 35. Let my "opponent, now, if he feels himself able, meet me on this "ground."[a]

In the above effusion, my Universalist opponent tries his talents for criticism. The following effort in the same way, is in his own words, viz. "The original text is ambiguous: "it is literally 'good were it for him, if that man were not "born.' It will admit of the following constructions, 'Good "were it for him (the Son of man) if that man (the traitor) "were not born.' Or, 'good were it for him (the traitor) if "that man (the Son of Man) were not born.' Or, (what is "more probably the true sense) 'good were it for him (the "traitor) if that man (the traitor) were not born.' Or, lastly, "(which is nearly the same in sense) 'good were it for him, "(the traitor) if he were not born that man.' But 'good "were it for that man (the traitor) if he had never been born,' "(that is, *never existed*) is a construction that the words "will not possibly bear. To prove this statement true, I "have only to refer to a passage where similar expressions "occur in the original. It is recorded in the book of Acts, "chapter seven, that Stephen made an address to his accu-"sers, in which he gives a history of all the great things "which God had done for his people in former times, from "the time when he appeared unto 'our father Abraham, "when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Char-"ran;' when he comes to speak of Moses, he says, 'at

[a] Minutes, p. p. 92, 93.

"which time Moses was born, εν ω καιρω εγεννηθη Μωυσης,'
"where the same verb, εγεννηθη, translated 'was born' occurs
"in the text in reference to Judas, 'ει ουκ εγεννηθη ο ανθρωπος,'
"excepting that in the one, the idiom of our language requires
"that it should be rendered in the indicative, and in the
"other, being preceded by the conjunction ει If, in the sub-
"junctive mood. Now what is the difference between these
"two passages? The only difference is, that the latter has
"the modifying particles ει, translated *if*, and the negative
"ουκ *not*, which, however, do not alter the meaning of the
"verb, which is precisely the same in both. Now if the
"verb εγεννηθη in the former, express the natural birth of
"Moses, by what mode of reasoning can we cause ουκ εγεννηθη
"in the latter to signify absolute non-existence? That these
"statements are literally true I appeal to our judges, and to
"all learned men. If I am wrong let me be contradicted.—
"Thus, you see, ends the discussion in relation to the dis-
"pute on the meaning of the passage in reference to Judas.
"Even my opponent dare not dispute the correctness of my
"statement. [*Here Mr. Kennedy, the second of Mr. M'Calla,*
"*one of the bench, arose and commenced some remarks but*
"*was silenced by Mr. M'Calla.*] You see my hearers, that
"his friend would have looked into the passage, but my op-
"ponent shrinks from the decision; and you now see how
"we stand on the subject to which I have called his atten-
"tion, and on which I am perfectly willing to rest this dis-
"cussion."[a]

In the same strain my Universalist opponent speaks as follows, viz. "The phrase in relation to Judas, is 'καλον ην
"αυτω ει ουκ εγεννηθη ο ανθρωπος εκεινος, good were it for that man
"if he had not been born.' My opponent says that the true
"meaning is 'good were it for Judas if he had never had
"any existence.' Now I ask, if Judas had never had a be-
"ing, could any thing have been good for him? Could any
"thing be good for you, my hearers, if you had never been
"brought into existence? The idea of any thing being good
"for Judas, implies in itself that he must have had a being."[b]

He reasons at another time in the following words, viz
"I am willing to rest the salvation on the plain testimony of
"God. This testimony, it is true, declares that 'by trans-
"gression Judas fell, that he might go to his own place.'
"Acts i. 25. But my opponent must prove that this place

a Minutes, p. p. 89, 90.
b Minutes, p. 78.

"is a place of endless misery. What says Jesus to his dis-
"ciples? 'ye which have followed me in the regeneration,
"when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory,
"ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve
"tribes of Israel.' Matt. xix. 28. Let the time referred to
"here, be when it may, the promise was made to the twelve
"when Judas constituted one of them. It will not do to say,
"that the promise can be fulfilled by supplying the place of
"Judas by Matthias, who was elected after the ascension of
"our Lord. The promise was made to that twelve to whom
"Christ spake, 'ye who have followed me,' and that the tes-
"timonies should be true, to them it must be fulfilled. If
"my opponent feels disposed to dispute all this, he is at
"liberty, and I hope I shall be able to meet his argu-
"ments."[a]

Mr. Winchester's mode of evading the force of this rigid authority, differs from that of my opponent. He thinks our Saviour's declaration concerning Judas equivalent to those of Job and Jeremiah concerning themselves. They cursed the day in which they were born, thinking that non existence was preferable to such an existence as theirs. He understands this to be the meaning of our Saviour with regard to Judas; that non-existance is preferable to such an existence as his. This author agrees in his calmer moments, with the hasty and improper decision of Job and Jeremiah, that annihilation is preferable even to these comparatively light afflictions which are but for a moment. He speaks as follows, viz. "And who would not, a thousand times, "choose rather never to have been born, than even to see, "far less experience, the miseries which came upon Jerusa-"lem and its inhabitants? Would it not have been better "for mothers never to have been born, than to have killed "and eaten their own children in the siege? and would it "not have been better for the children never to have been "born, than to have been food for their mothers?"[b] He might as well have asked, was not annihilation preferable to the martyrdom of Ignatius and many others, who were food for lions? Surely not: because these martyrs inherit that everlasting glory which Mr. Winchester vainly expects for the devoted inhabitants of Jerusalem. If they were ever to attain this eternal joy, it is well for them to have been born, if, between their birth and their glorification, they had

a Minutes, p. 91.
b Dialogue 2nd.

to endure ten thousand sieges of Jerusalem. The infinite superiority of endless happiness over temporary pain shews the rashness of the complaints and wishes of the inspired mourners above mentioned. But was our Saviour rash? Was he under the influence of ignorance, impatience, or resentment, when after weighing the good and the evil of this traitor's career, he declared that annihilation was preferable to such an existence! "It had been good for that man if "he had not been born."

After having rejected our translation, and amused the audience with a great variety of translations, my opponent at last agrees that the passage means, "good were it for him, "(the traitor,) if that man, (the traitor,) were not born." The result, then, of his pedantic criticisms is this; that he has given us a translation agreeing with our own, and has accompanied it with a paraphrase which establishes our interpretation! "Good were it for him, (the traitor,) if that man, "(the traitor,) were not born." It would be good for Judas, if he were not born: that is, if he were in a state of non-existence as he was before his birth. It is true that a state of non-existence has no positive good attending it; but is it not grammatical, intelligible and scriptural, to say that annihilation would be comparatively a blessing to that man, to whom existence is a curse? Yet this sort of language my opponent endeavours to shew is inconsistent with sound philosophy, and the usages of Greek writers. He would have us believe that the fact of Moses, being *born*, means the same thing as a supposition that Judas is *not born*, because the word *born* is used in both cases. He admits that the one is an affirmative and the other a negative: and yet by quoting a great deal of Greek, and using many grammatical terms, he calculates on making you believe that a fact and a supposition, an affirmative and a negative, mean the same thing. "Now what is the difference between these two passages?" he gravely asks. I know not how to do justice to his learning and his powers of reasoning, better than by putting his argument into a syllogistic, and almost a poetical form.

Major proposition. εγεννηθη Μωυσης = ει ουκ εγεννηθη ο ανθρωπος εκεινος.

Minor proposition. Indicative, Subjunctive, Original, Particles, Idiom.

Conclusion. Therefore, to be born, and not to be born both presuppose existence, and mean the same thing, according to the philosophy of the Universalists.

If the mere use of the same verb in relation to Moses and Judas, will authorize such a wild conclusion, then it is as true, that *Jonah swallowed the Whale*, as that *the Whale swallowed Jonah*, because not only the same *verb* but the same *words* throughout occur in both these propositions.

When the Scriptures declare that "by transgression Ju-"das fell, that he might go to his own place,"[a] my opponent says that his own place is one of those twelve thrones on which the Apostles shall judge the twelve tribes of Israel. He considers his right to this glory secured to him by the unconditional promise of Christ; and that veracity requires that he be enthroned.

It is freely admitted that veracity requires the fulfilment of every promise, as it certainly does the execution of every threat. But where do we find a promise that Judas shall inherit a crown of glory, with or without regeneration, repentance, or faith? The promise referred to, in Matt. xix. 28, is so far from being unconditional, that it expressly confines the benefits promised, to those who had forsaken all, and followed him, "in the regeneration." "Then answered "Peter and said unto him, behold! *we have forsaken all, and* "*followed thee*: what shall we have, therefore? And Jesus "said unto them, verily I say unto you, that ye which have "*followed me, in the regeneration*, when the Son of man shall "sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve "thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Here the enquiry is made, not concerning unbelievers and traitors, but concerning self-denied and faithful disciples. The promise *which* the answer contains, describes the same characters, "ye which have followed me in the regeneration." That regeneration is essential to entering the kingdom of heaven, our Saviour has expressly declared.[b] That Judas was born again, at the time when this promise was given, will not probably be contended; and it will soon be seen that he had no saving interest in the *Christian dispensation*, which some will understand by *regeneration*. That he had not *forsaken all*, is evident from the reason which is given for his recommending that the ointment be sold, and the money given to the poor. "This he said, not that he cared for the poor; *but* because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bare what was put therein."[c] This also makes it plain that he had not *followed* Christ: for he could not serve God and Mam-

a Acts. i. 25.
b In. iii. 3, 5.
c In. xii. 6.

mon. That he followed the devil instead of Christ is manifest from scripture prophecy and history. Peter[a] refers us to a Psalm which says, concerning him, "let Satan stand at "his right hand." Peter, in quoting a part of this Psalm, the whole of which relates to Judas, says, "this scripture "must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost, by "the mouth of David, spake concerning Judas, which was "guide to them that took Jesus." As a fulfilment of the above scripture, it is expressly stated that "Satan entered "into him:"[b] and our Saviour himself says to these twelve Apostles, to whose persons identically and universally my opponent says the promise was made; to these twelve he says, "one of you is a devil."[c] Did he afterward promise that this devil should be enthroned as a judge of his people? That very scripture which was fulfilled in his diabolical possession, declared that, instead of judging Israel, he himself should be judged and condemned; and that instead of being enthroned as an Apostle, another should take that office from which he fell by transgression. David says, "When he "shall be judged let him be condemned; and let his prayer "become sin. Let his days be few; and let another take his "office." After the death of Judas, and the ascension of Christ, Peter says, "it is written in the book of Psalms, let "his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein: "and his bishopric let another take." Accordingly, the Apostles pray God to appoint a successor, "that he may "take part of this ministry and Apostleship, from which Ju-"das by transgression fell, that he might go to his own "place."[d] To his own place! Is heaven that place, as my opponent says? "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lu-"cifer, son of the morning!" Judas is not called a son of the morning, but he is called "a son of perdition;" and of course, perdition with Lucifer, is his own place. "The *transgres-"sors* shall be destroyed together[e] "Judas by *transgres-"sion* fell." "The wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and "the *transgressors* shall be rooted ont of it."[f] I ask not whether he was rooted out of the earth by involuntary suffocation, voluntary strangulation, or precipitation from the top of a rock. Certain it is, as my opponent acknowledges, that "falling headlong, he burst asunder, and all his bow-"els gushed out:" and it is no less certain that this was

a Acts i. 16, 20.
b In. xiii. 27.
c John vi. 70.
d Ps. cix. 7. 8. Acts i. 20, 25.
e Ps. xxxvii. 38.
f Prov. ii. 22.

predicted as an introduction to a place of cursing and not of blessing. "As he loved cursing, so let it come unto him: as "he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him. As "he clothed himself with cursing, like as with his garment, "so let it come *into his bowels like water*, and like oil into his "bones."[a] What is the proper place of a fallen star but with those "wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness "of darkness forever?"[b] If Tophet be the proper place of a *thief* and *traitor*;—if perdition be the proper place of a "son "of perdition;"—and if hell be the proper place of "a devil;" —then it is plain where this most conspicuous of hypocrites went, when he went "to his own place."

But my opponent says, "if salvation be predicated on re-"pentance, we have the same evidence, yea, if possible, better "evidence of the repentance of Judas, than we have of the "repentance of Peter." Doubtless my opponent has read Campbell's preliminary dissertation on the word *repentance*, and has observed that the Scriptures generally use one word[c] to signify *evangelical repentance*, which is the work of the Spirit of sanctification, and another word[d] to denote that regret which is no way inconsistent with the most depraved disposition. In the Septuagint, it is used to denote the malignant chagrin of the Moabites, on being conquered by the Israelites. "And there was great repentance against Israel." In the Apocrypha, its conjugate is used to mark that repentance "which devoted sinners exercised" for having once performed their duty. "As for the ungodly, wrath came upon them without mercy unto the end; for he knew before, what they would do: how that having given them leave to depart, and sent them hastily away, they would *repent* and *pursue* them." In the Septuagint, it is used to denote that sorrow which the children of Israel felt for having left Egypt. "For God said, lest peradventure the people *repent* when they see war, and they return to Egypt." It is also used to point out the final and irremediable sorrow of the despisers of God's word and ordinances. "And thou *repent* at the last, when thy flesh and thy body are consumed."[e]

That Judas' repentance was of this sort is evident from the fact that his remorse was unavailing. He was condemned and degraded by divine authority. "For it is written in the book of Psalms, "let his habitation be desolate, and let no

---

a Ps. cix. 17, 18. b Jude xiii.
c μετανοια d μεταμελεια
e 2 Kgs. iii. 27. Wisd. xix. 2. Ex. xiii. 17. Prov. v. 11.

man dwell therein: and his bishopric let another take." Another was accordingly appointed, to "take part of this "ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgres-"sion, fell."[a] If he sincerely repented, why was he thus disgraced? God has said, "If we confess our sins, he is "faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us "from all unrighteousness."[b] Accordingly Peter was forgiven, and was never deposed from his office, either living or dying. Although he is not near so amiable a character as Judas, in the view of my opponent, yet before another judge, he was far more lovely. Was it ever said that he fell from his office by transgression, that he might go to his own place? His heart was set upon the place where Christ is, and thither Christ had promised that he should go. On his repentance he was immediately forgiven, and at his death he was immediately glorified. If Judas had repented sincerely, the same would have been true concerning him. It would therefore have been exceedingly good for him to have been born, if his life of suffering here had been prolonged to millions of ages. But now it is said, according to my opponent's translation and paraphrase, "Good were it for him (the traitor) if that man (the traitor) were not born." Was this ever said of Peter? or could it be said of him with truth? It may be said with truth, that no possible degree of suffering, howsoever protracted, can make it good for a man not to have been born, if that suffering be succeeded by eternal happiness;—But infallible wisdom and veracity have declared, "It had been good for that man if he had not been born;"—Therefore his punishment is absolutely eternal.

The evidence of Judas' condemnation to the torments of hell is so overwhelming, that Mr. Winchester, however reluctantly, admitted it; although he vainly *supposed* that his punishment in hell would not be absolutely eternal. The following extract will show his sentiments, viz. "If such a "man [as Job] had reason to say 'wherefore then hast thou "brought me forth out of the womb? O that I had given up "the ghost, and no eye had seen me! I should have been as "though I had not been; I should have been carried from "the womb to the grave,' (see Job x. 18, 19,) with what "amazing propriety might Christ say of Judas, the traitor, "who sinned in such a dreadful manner, and had such hor-"rible guilt on his conscience: who died in black despair, "perished in such an awful situation, *in his sins*, and, proba-

a Acts i 20. 25. b 1 John i. 9.

"bly, by his own hands, who suffered the most violent agi-
"tations of mind, died under the power of the horrid sugges-
"tions of the great enemy of men, without one smile or look
"of forgiveness, from Jesus, or even daring to seek it;
"whose sorrow in this life far exceeded Job's, (for Job had
"no sense of guilt, treason, and ingratitude; nor was he
"filled with rage, blasphemy and despair) and who must pro-
"bably have his portion in the second death;—[Well may
"he say of such a character,] 'good were it for that man if
"he had never been born!' even upon the *supposition* that
"his torments are not designed to continue while God ex-
"ists."[a]

As my opponent has exhibited a great anxiety to refer the case of Judas to a human tribunal, and as he has, without my consent, applied to the moderators for their decision, what would he think of having his criticisms and arguments referred to Mr. Winchester, who, as well as my opponent, may be considered as receiving his ordination in an uninterrupted line, from this true Universalist Apostle. My opponent says that the original "words will not possibly bear" the construction "good were it for that man (the traitor) if "he had never been born." Mr. Winchester uses these very words, "good were it for that man, if he had never been "born," as the correct translation, and in the very meaning which my opponent says "the words will not possibly bear." In his day Universalism had not discovered, that a sufficient quantity of grammar and Greek would prove, that *to be born*, and *not to be born* meant the same thing. My opponent would persuade you that when Judas passed through the dark valley and shadow of death, he had the rod and staff of his heavenly shepherd to comfort him; Mr. Winchester intimates that he was attended by a very different character; that he "died under the power of the horrid suggestions of "the great enemy of men, without one smile, or look of for-"giveness, from Jesus, or even daring to seek it." Not so with Peter. My opponent would urge that the traitor died by excess of pious grief; Mr. Winchester admits that he "suffer-"ed the most violent agitations of mind," and that this arose from "horrible guilt on his conscience," but so far was he from believing that this noted convict obtained relief from guilt, and was filled with hope and love, he believed that he was *filled* with *ingratitude* and "rage, blasphemy and des-"pair." My opponent insists that he died a true penitent,

a Dialogue 2d.

cleansed from sin, without the guilt of suicide, and that he went to his own throne of glory, and not to his own place of torment. Mr Winchester believes that he died in "an awful situation, in his sins, and probably by his own hands," "and must probably have his portion in the second death." Yes, Mr. Winchester believes that this traitor lived and died without an interest in Christ the only Saviour; and that he *probably* killed himself, and that he will *probably* suffer the punishment of his crimes in that hell which is after death. When one Universalist *flatly* denies the truth, it is pleasant to hear another admit, that the truth is *probably* true.

3. *Interrogation.* This familiar figure of speech differs from a simple affirmation, chiefly in its being a more animated mode of expression. The doctrine of the divine omnipotence and incomprehensibility, and of the pitiable impotency, and hereditary depravity of man, are not more pointedly asserted by the most direct affirmation, than by such expressions as the following; "Is the Lord's hand waxed short?" "Is any thing too hard for the Lord?" "Canst thou by "searching, find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty "unto perfection?" "Can the Ethiopean change his skin, or "the leopard his spots?" "Who can bring a clean thing out "of an unclean? Not one."[a]

Aware of the force of this argument, my opponent treats it as follows, viz. "I admit the force of a statement, by way "of *interrogation*, on subjects that are self-evident, or, are "not disputed, but no disputed proposition, it is evident, can "be settled by this species of argument."[b] This view of the subject is quite original. If correct, it would make a great deal of the Bible as worthless as waste paper. That the views and wishes of writers and speakers, inspired and uninspired, in relation not only to axioms, but to matters of fact and reasoning, can be perspicuously communicated in the form of interrogation, is so obvious, and a matter of such constant experience, that courts of justice have, time immemorial, interposed their authority to prevent attornies from asking leading questions to witnesses; because these questions shew how the party wishes them answered. But all the questions in the Bible shew the belief or desire of him who asks them; and this belief or desire is communicated in the interrogative form, not because it is equivocal, but because it is the very contrary, and exhibits the

a Num. xi. 23. Gen. xviii. 14. Job xi. 7. Jer. xiii. 23. Job xiv. 4.
b Minutes p. 70.

sentiment with greater force. I never knew this principle denied by any man of common sense, my opponent only excepted. Mr. Ballou, in quoting the question, "how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" declares that when our Saviour proposed this interrogatory to his wicked audience, "he *pronounced* on them the damnation of hell."[a] Thus, according to him, and according to every man who understands language, a threat or prediction, no way evident, but involving a disputed point, may be unequivocally *pronounced* in the form of interrogation.

In the same spirit of this denunciation of our Saviour,[b] Peter says, "if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" The foregoing question tells us that they will appear in hell; from which the impossibility of escaping is often urged. "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation!" God says by Jeremiah, "How shall I pardon thee for this?" Our Saviour says, "What is a man advantaged if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away?" or according to another Evangelist, "What is a man profited if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?"[c]

The only subterfuge which my opponent is observed to use, in order to escape the last authority, is, that "the word here rendered *soul*, is rendered *life*, in the verse immediately preceding."[d] In answer to this, let it be remarked that as the soul has a death of its own, so has the soul a life of its own: and this very preceding verse is directly in proof that it is the life of the soul that is here meant. "For whosoever "*will* save his [bodily] life, shall lose *it*, [the life of his soul.] "and whosoever will lose his [bodily] life, for my sake, shall "find *it*, [the life of his soul.] For what is a man profited "if he gain the whole world, and lose [the life of] his own "*soul*? or what shall a man give in exchange for [the life "of] his soul?" That this is the meaning in a similar passage of Job[e] is plain. "For what is the hope of the hy-"pocrite, though he hath gained, when God taketh away "his soul? Will God hear his cry, when trouble cometh up-"on him? Will he delight himself in the Almighty? will "he always call upon God?" Universalism answers these

a Notes on parable 26th.
b Matt. xxiii. 33.
c Matt. xxiii. 33. 1 Peter iv. 18. Hebr. ii. 3. Jer. v. 7. Luke ix. 25. Matt. xvi. 26.
d Minutes p. 55.
e xxvii 8, 10.

"questions in one way, and it is evident that God intended "them to be answered in another.[a]

THIRD ORTHODOX ARGUMENT.

CONTRAST.

It was proposed to show that the scriptures mark such a *contrast* between the righteous and the wicked, as to their character, standing, and future destiny, as can be satisfactorily explained on no other ground than the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the ungodly. As many more authorities must be quoted here than in the last argument, time forbids that my comments should be frequent or copious: neither will it be of any use to repeat several passages or their parallels, which have already been quoted for other purposes.[b]

The distinction between Mount Gerizzem and Mount Ebal was not more marked, that were the condition and prospects of those who were so abundantly blessed from the one, and those who were cursed from the other.[c] "Behold "I set before you this day a blessing and a curse: a blessing, "if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I "command you this day; and a curse, if ye will not obey "the commandments of the Lord your God; but turn aside "out of the way which I command you this day, to go after "other Gods which ye have not known."[d] "For evil doers "shall be cut off: but those that wait upon the Lord, they "shall inherit the earth. For yet a little while, and the wick-"ed shall not be: yea, thou shalt diligently consider his "place, and it shall not be.[e] But the meek shall inherit the "earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of "peace. The wicked plotteth against the just, and gnash-"eth upon him with his teeth. The Lord shall laugh at "him: for he seeth that his day is coming. The wicked "have drawn out the sword, and have bent their bow; to "cast down the poor and needy, and to slay such as be of "upright conversation. Their sword shall enter into their

---

a Job xi. 20, 36; 18. Ps. xix. 6,—9. Hebr. xii. 25.

b Luke vi. 20.—26. 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21. Ps. xxii. 29. Ez. xvii. 24. Gen. xii. 3. Ps. xvii. 14.

c Deut. Chapters 27 & 28.

d Deut. 11; 26—28.

e Neither the original nor the translation gives any countenance to the opinion of my opponent or of the destructionists, that there shall be no wicked persons hereafter; but only that they shall be *brought to nought*, by falling from a high to a low condition;——by suffering the disappointment of their vain expectations;—and receiving the punishment of their many sins.

"own heart, and their bows shall be broken. A little that "a righteous man hath, is better than the riches of many "wicked. For the arms of the wicked shall be broken: but "the Lord upholdeth the righteous. The Lord knoweth the "days of the upright: and their inheritance shall be fore-"ver. They shall not be ashamed in the evil time: and in "the days of famine they shall be satisfied. But the wick-"ed shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as "the fat of lambs: they shall consume: into smoke shall "they consume away. The wicked borroweth and payeth "not again: but the righteous sheweth mercy and giveth. "For such as be blessed of him shall inherit the earth; and "they that be cursed of him shall be cut off."[a] "Shew "thy marvellous loving kindness, O thou that savest, by thy "right hand them which put their trust in thee, from those "that rise up against them." "Arise O Lord! disappoint "him, cast him down: deliver my soul from the wicked, "which is thy sword." "As for me, I will behold thy face "in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake, with "thy likeness."[b] "Do they not err that devise evil? but "mercy and truth shall be to them that devise good."[c] "By "the blessing of the upright, the city is exalted; but it is "overthrown by the mouth of the wicked."[d] "They shall "be ashamed, and also confounded, all of them: they shall "go to confusion together, that are makers of idols. But "Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting sal-"vation: ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded, world "without end."[e] "He preserveth not the life of the wicked, "but giveth right to the poor."[f] "Envy thou not the op-"pressor, and choose none of his ways: for the froward is "abomination to the Lord: but his secret is with the righ-"teous. The curse of the Lord is in the house of the wicked: "but he blesseth the habitation of the just. Surely he scor-"neth the scorners: but he giveth grace unto the lowly. "The wise shall inherit glory: but shame shall be the pro-"motion of fools."[g] "Whosoever heareth these sayings of "mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, "which built his house upon a rock; and the rain descend-"ed, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat up-"on that house, and it fell not; for it was founded upon a

a Ps. xxxvii. 9—22.
b Ps. xvii. 7, 13, 15.
c Prov. xiv. 22.
d Prov. xi. 11.
e Is. lxv. 16, 17.
f Job xxxvi. 6.
g Prov. iii. 32—35.

"rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, "and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, "which built his house upon the sand: and the rain descend-"ed, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat up-"on that house, and it fell; and great was the fall of it."[a] "Who then, is a faithful and wise servant, whom his Lord "hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in "due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his Lord, when "he cometh, shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you, "that he shall make him ruler over all his goods. But and "if that evil servant shall say in his heart, my Lord delay-"eth his coming, and shall begin to smite his fellow servants, "and to eat and drink with the drunken; the Lord of that "servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, "and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him "asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites, "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."[b] "Take, "therefore, the talent from him, and give it unto him which "had ten talents. For unto every one that hath, shall be "given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that "hath not, shall be taken away even that which he hath. "And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."[c] "He an-"swered and said unto them, because it is given unto you to "know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them "it is not given. For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, "and he shall have more abundance; but whosoever hath "not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath."[d] "As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I "hated." "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have "mercy, and whom he will, he hardeneth." "Hath not the "potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one "vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor? What if "God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power "known, endured with much long-suffering, the vessels of "wrath fitted to destruction; and that he might make known "the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he "had afore prepared unto glory."[e] "Thou hast hid these "things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them "unto babes."[f] "For the Lord knoweth the way of the "righteous: but the way of the ungodly shall perish."[g] "And

a Matt. vii. 24—27.
b Matt. xxiv. 45—51.
c Matt. xxv. 28—31.
d Matt. xiii. 11, 12.
e Rom. ix 13, 18, 20—23.
f Matt. i. 25.
g Ps. i. 6.

"the afflicted people thou wilt save: but thine eyes are upon "the haughty, that thou mayest bring them down."[a] "For "behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all "the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: "and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord "of Hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. "But unto you that fear my name, shall the Son of righte- "ousness arise, with healing in his wings; and ye shall go "forth, and grow up as calves of the stall. And ye shall "tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the "soles of your feet, in the day that I shall do this, saith the "Lord of hosts."[b] "And I will feed them that oppress thee "with their own flesh, and they shall be drunken with their "own blood, as with sweet wine. And all flesh shall know "that I, the Lord, am thy Saviour, and thy Redeemer, the "Mighty one of Jacob."[c] "Rejoice O ye nations! with "his people; for he will avenge the blood of his servants, "and will render vengeance to his adversaries, and will be "merciful unto his land, and to his people."[d] "Keeping mer- "cy for thousands; forgiving iniquity, and transgression, "and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty."[e] "But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are par- "takers, then are ye bastards and not sons."[f] "The king- "dom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea, "and gathered of every kind: which, when it was full, they "drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into "vessels, but cast the bad away. So shall it be at the end of "the world: the angels shall come forth, and sever the "wicked from among the just; and shall cast them into the "furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of "teeth."[g] "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness; "but the righteous hath hope in his death."[h] "The Son of "man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out "of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do "iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there "shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the "righteous shine forth as the Sun, in the kingdom of their "Father."[i] "The hope of the righteous shall be gladness; "but the expectation of the wicked shall perish."[j] "And

a 2 Sam. xxii. 28.
b Mal. iv. 1—3.
c Isa. lxix. 26.
d Deut. xxxii. 43.
e Ex. xxxiv. 7.
f Hebr. xii. 8.
g Matt. xiii. 47—50.
h Prov. xiv. 32.
i Matt. xiii. 41—43.
j Prov. x. 28.

"while they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they "that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and "the door was shut. Afterward came also the other vir- "gins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered "and said, verily I say unto you, I know you not."[a] "I "create the fruit of the lips; peace, peace, to him that is far "off, and to him that is near, saith the Lord; and I will heal "him. But the wicked are like the troubled sea, when it "cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt. There "is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked."[b] "For the "preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; "but unto us who are saved, it is the power of God."[c] "But "we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of "them that believe to the saving of the soul."[d] "He that "believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life; and he that be- "lieveth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of "God abideth on him."[e] "And the nations were angry, "and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they "should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward un- "to thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them "that fear thy name, small and great: and shouldest des- "troy them which destroy the earth."[f] "And there shall in no "wise enter into it, any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever "worketh abomination, or maketh a lie, but they which are "written in the Lamb's book of life."[g] "Whose fan is in his "hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his "wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with "unquenchable fire."[h] "The men of Nineveh shall rise in "judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: be- "cause they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and be- "hold, a greater than Jonas is here! The queen of the "south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, "and shall condemn it: for she came from the uttermost "parts of the earth, to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and "behold a greater than Solomon is here. When the un- "clean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry "places, seeking rest, and findeth none. Then he saith, I "will return into my house from whence I came out; and "when he is come, he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished. "Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits "more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell

a Matt. 25; 10—12.
b Is. 57; 19—21.
c 1 Cor. 1; 18.
d Heb. 10; 39.
e Jn. 3; 36.
f Rev. 11; 18.
g Rev. 21; 27.
h Matt. 3; 12.

"there: and the last state of that man is worse than the "first. Even so shall it be also unto this wicked genera- "tion."[a] "Let death seize upon *them*, and let *them* go "down quick into hell: for wickedness is in their dwellings, "and among them. As for *me*, *I* will call upon God, and "the Lord shall save *me*." "Cast thy burden upon the "Lord, and he shall sustain thee: he shall never suffer the "righteous to be moved. But thou, O God! shalt bring "them down unto the pit of destruction: bloody and deceit- "ful men shall not live out half their days; but I will trust "in thee."[b] "Who will render to every man accord- "to his deeds; to them who, by patient continuance "in well doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immor- "tality; eternal life: but unto them that are conten- "tious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteous- "ness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, up- "on every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and "also of the Gentile. But glory, honor, and peace, to every "man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the "Gentile; for there is no respect of persons with God."[c] "He that believeth, and is baptized shall be saved; but he "that believeth not shall be damned."[d] "Marvel not at "this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in "their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; "they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; "and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of dam- "nation."[e] "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and "he which is filthy, let him be fifthy still: and he that is "righteous let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, "let him be holy still."[f] "And these shall go away into "everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eter- "nal."[g] "And besides all this, between us and you there is "a great gulph fixed: so that they which would pass from "hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that "would come from thence."[h]

One would suppose that Mr Balfour himself could scarcely demand a greater multiplicity of authorities than I have cited. That they are to the point, will appear by remarking the contrast which they note, 1. In the characters of men. They are spoken of as faithful and unprofitable; humble and

a Matt. 12; 41—45.
b Ps. 55; 15, 16, 22, 23.
c Rom. 2; 6—11.
d Mk. 16; 16.
e Jn. 5; 28, 29.
f Rev. 22; 11.
g Matt. 25; 46.
h Luke. 16; 26.

proud; wise and foolish; good and bad; holy and unjust; righteous and wicked; believers and unbelievers. 2. There is a contrast in their standing in the sight of their Maker and Judge; as they are written or not written in the book of life; bastards or sons; adversaries or people; built on the sand or the rock; condemned or justified; cursed or blessed. 3. There is a contrast in their future destiny; as they perish or as they are saved; rewarded or destroyed; gathered as heirs of salvation, or cast down, cast away, and driven away, as heirs of perdition; stored in heaven or burned in hell; continuing holy still and unjust still; sentenced to eternal life and eternal punishment; to torment and comfort; between which there is an impassable gulph.

Now if my opponent can prove that good is evil and evil good; that bitter is sweet and sweet bitter; that darkness is light and light darkness; and if he can prove in opposition to the above passages, that the righteous shall fall for ever, then may he prove that the finally impenitent shall be saved.

FOURTH ORTHODOX ARGUMENT.

NEGATION.

It is proposed to prove the absolute eternity of the sinner's punishment by negative expressions of scripture, in which the termination of that punishment is plainly denied. Eternity is correctly defined by *endless* duration. It is by such a mode of expression that the bible conveys to us the doctrine of the eternity of God, the eternity of Christ's kingdom, and the eternity of the saint's happiness. If these things can be shewn, then the use of such language in relation to the sinner's punishment will certainly prove its absolute eternity. These particulars shall now be made out in the order in which they are here mentioned.

1. The eternity of God is communicated, by denying that his existence has an end. "Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end."[a]

2. The eternity of Christ's kingdom is proved in the same way. "His dominion is an everlasting dominion

a Ps. cii. 25—27.

"which shall *not* pass away, and his kingdom that which "shall not be destroyed." "Of the increase of his go-"ernment and peace there shall be *no end*, upon the "throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to "establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth "even for ever." In Mr. Ballou's Treatise on Atonement,[a] he admits the force of these passages, when he says that in "Isaiah ix 6, 7, the Saviour is Prophecied of, as possessing "a kingdom, the increase of which shall have *no end*. To "the same purpose see also Dan. vii. 14."

3. The eternity of the saint's happiness is declared by negative expressions. "And when the chief Shepherd shall "appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory, that "fadeth *not* away." Again, this is called "an *incor-"ruptible*" crown, and "a kingdom which *cannot* be mo-"ved."[b] "He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed "in white raiment; and I will *not* blot out his name out of "the book of life, but I will confess his name before my Fa-"ther, and before his angels." "For I will *not* contend for-"ever, *neither* will I be always wroth." "And God shall "wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be "*no more* death, *neither*, sorrow, *nor*, crying, *neither* shall "there be any more pain."[c] Mr. Ballou, in the place above referred to, admits the force of this last text in the following words, viz. "How can it be said that God shall "wipe away all tears from the eyes of men, if millions are "to mourn to an endless eternity? Or, why is it said, there "shall be *no more* sorrow, crying *nor* pain, if sorrow, cry-"ing, and infinite pain are never to cease?" Also, the force of the text preceding the last, is admitted and urged by Mr. Winchester, in his 2d and 4th Dialogues.

Now if it be admitted by all parties; and if it be true, whether admitted or not; that this sort of language is valid proof of the eternity of God, of the eternity of Christ's kingdom, and of the eternity of the Saints' happiness, what but prejudice and unbelief, can prevent us from receiving it, in proof of the eternity of the sinner's punishment? But the relevancy of such evidence, if it can be found, even in support of this obnoxious doctrine, has already been implicitly acknowledged by Mr. Winchester himself, while trying to build a bridge across the impassable gulph. His words are the

a p. 200.
b 1 Pet. v. 4. 1 Cor. ix. 25. Hebr xii. 28.
c Isa. lvii. 16. Rev. iii. 5. xxi. 4.

following, viz. "We cannot positively conclude against the "restoration, from this passage of the rich man, unless we "could find some passages of Scripture, where God has pro-"mised never to restore, or reconcile such to himself, whom "he hath once cast off."[a] This is as much as to say that if "we could find some passages of scripture, where God has "promised [or threatened] *never* to restore, or reconcile such "to himself, whom he hath once cast off," then the rich man and all who die in their sins, shall be in torment to an absolute eternity.

"And the Lord said, my Spirit shall *not always* strive "with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an "hundred and twenty years."[b] The meaning of this passage evidently is, that the day of grace, or an opportunity of salvation, shall *not* last *always*, but its utmost extent shall be only during a man's life; which was usually seven or eight hundred years before the flood, one hundred and twenty after it, and is now three score and ten.

"*Not* every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter "into the kingdom of heaven." "For I say unto you that "*none* of those which were bidden, shall taste of my supper."[c] "Plead with your mother, plead: for she is *not* my wife, "*neither* am I her husband:" "and I will *not* have mercy "upon her children." "I will *no more* have mercy upon the "house of Israel:" "for ye are *not* my people, and I will "*not* be your God." "He that made them, will *not* have "mercy on them, and he that formed them will shew them *no* "favour."[d] "For he shall have judgment *without mercy*, that "hath shewn no mercy." "The same shall drink of the wine "of the wrath of God, which is poured out *without mixture*, "into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented "with fire and brimstone, in the presence of the holy angels, "and in the presence of the Lamb. And the smoke of their "torment ascendeth up forever and ever: and they have *no* "*rest* day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, "and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." "But "if ye forgive not men their trespasses, *neither* will your "Father forgive your trespasses." "Follow peace with all "men, and holiness, without which, *no* man shall see the "Lord." "The Lord is slow to anger, and great in power, "and will *not at all* acquit the wicked." "He shall lean up-

---

a Dialogue 2nd.
b Gen. vi. 3.
c Matt. vii. 21. Luke xiv. 24.
d Hosea ii. 2. 4. 1; vi. 9. Isa. 27; 1

"on his house, but it shall *not* stand: he shall hold it fast, "but it shall *not* endure."[a] "Behold! I Paul say unto you, "that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you *nothing*." "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; "for there is *no* work, *nor* device, *nor* knowledge, *nor* wisdom, "in the grave whither thou goest." "I must work the works "of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, "when no man can work." "He that, being often reproved, "hardeneth his neck, shall be suddenly destroyed, and that "*without remedy*.", "Therefore the ungodly shall *not* stand "in the judgment, *nor* sinners in the congregation of the "righteous." "There is *no peace* saith the Lord, unto the "wicked." "He that believeth not the Son, shall *not* see "life." "*No* murderer hath eternal life."[b] "But the eyes "of the wicked shall *fail*, and they shall *not escape*, and their "hope shall be as *the giving up of the ghost*." "For thus "saith the Lord, thy bruise is *incurable*, and thy wound is "grievous." "Why criest thou for thine affliction? Thy "sorrow is *incurable* for the multitude of thine iniquity: be-"cause thy sins were increased I have done these things un-"to thee." "For her wound is *incurable*." "Because there "is wrath, beware lest he take thee away with his stroke, "then a great ransom *cannot deliver* thee." "*None* of them "*can* by any means redeem his brother, *nor* give to God a "ransom for him; (for the redemption of *their soul* is pre-"cious, and it *ceaseth forever*;) that he should still live for-"ever, and not see corruption."[c] "Seek ye the Lord, and ye "shall live; lest he break out like fire in the house of Jo-"seph, and devour it, and there be *none* to quench it in "Bethel." "But if ye will not hearken unto me, to hallow "the Sabbath Day, and not bear a burden, even entering in "at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath Day: then will "I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the "palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall *not* be quenched." "Cir-"cumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the fore-"skins of your heart, ye men of Judah, and inhabitants of "Jerusalem: lest my fury come forth like fire, and burn "that *none* can quench it, because of the evil of your doings." "O house of David! thus saith the Lord; execute judgment "in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the

a Jas. 2; 13. Rev. 14; 10, 11. Matt. 6: 15. Hebr. 12: 14. Nah. 1: 3. Job 3; 15.

b Gal. 5. 2. Eccles. 9; 10. In. 9: 4. Prov. 29; 1. Ps. 1; 5. Isa. 48; 22. In. 3: 36. 1 In. 3; 15.

c Job 11: 20. Jer. 30: 12. 15. Mic. 1; 9. Job 36; 18. Ps. 49; 6—9.

"hand of the oppressor, lest my fury go out like fire, and "burn that *none* can quench it, because of the evil of your "doings." "Because they have forsaken me, and have burnt "incense unto other gods, that they might provoke me to an-"ger with all the works of their hands; therefore my wrath "shall be kindled against this place, and shall *not* be quench-"ed." "Son of man, set thy face toward the south, and drop "thy word toward the south, and prophecy against the forest "of the south field. And say to the forest of the south, hear "the word of the Lord: thus saith the Lord God; behold! "I will kindle a fire in thee, and it shall devour every green "tree in thee, and every dry tree: the flaming flame shall "*not* be quenched, and all faces from the south to the north "shall be burned therein. And all flesh shall see that I the "Lord have kindled it: it shall *not* be quenched. Then said "I, ah, Lord God! they say of me, doth he not speak para-"bles?"[a] "If thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for "thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go "into hell, into the fire that *never shall be quenched*; where "their worm dieth *not*, and the fire is *not* quenched. And if "thy foot offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to "enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, "into the fire that *never shall be quenched*; where their worm "dieth *not*, and the fire is *not* quenched. And if thine eye "offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter "into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two "eyes, to be cast into hell-fire, where their worm dieth *not* "and the fire is *not* quenched." "He will burn up the chaff "with *unquenchable fire*." "There are the workers of ini-"quity fallen: they are cast down and shall *not* be able to "rise." And in hell he lifted up his eyes being in torments, "and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. "And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy "on me; and send Lazarus, that he may dip the "tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am "tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, son, remem-"ber that thou in thy life time, receivedst thy good things, "and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted "and thou art tormented. And besides all this, between us "and you there is a great gulph fixed; so that they which "would pass from hence to you *cannot*; *neither can* they "pass to us, that would come from thence."[b]

---

a Amos 5; 6. Jer. 17; 27. 4; 4. 21; 12. 2 Kgs. 22; 17. Ez; 20. 45—48.
b Mk 9, 43—48. Matt. 8, 12. Ps. 36, 12, Luke 16, 23—26,

"There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall "pray for it." "For *it is impossible* for those who were "once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and "were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted "of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to "come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto re-"pentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of "God afresh, and put him to an open shame." "For if we "sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of "the truth, there remaineth *no more* sacrifice for sins, but a "certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indigna-"tion which shall devour the adversaries." "And whoso-"ever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be "forgiven him: but unto him that blasphemeth against the "Holy Ghost, it shall *not* be forgiven." "But he that shall blas-"pheme against the Holy Ghost, hath *never* forgiveness, but "is in danger of eternal damnation" "It shall *not* be for-"given him, *neither* in this world, *neither* in the world to "come."[a]

It will not do to deny or despise the above passages, after giving them the name of parables: for this foil was tried in vain by the adversary, in the time of Ezekiel.[b] It will not do to get clear of the worm that dieth not, by turning it into a butterfly, as it is said Mr. Mitchel of New-York does. Such objections prove nothing more than the deep depravity or profane levity of those who raise them. Neither will it avail, to show that God has threatened to pour out his unquenchable fury "upon man and upon *beast*:"[c] for if by perversion, we apply to the irrational creation, that which is inapplicable to them, then, to be consistent, we must admit that beasts can sin, repent, and pray; and that they can obtain pardon and salvation; and of course be liable to an absolutely eternal punishment. This will appear from Jonah iii. 8—10. "But let man and beast be covered with sack-"cloth, and cry mightily unto God: yea let them turn every "one from his evil way, and from the violence that is in their "hands." But such interpretations I consider much of a piece with that which scoffing infidels give to Isa. xxxvii. 36. "And when they arose early in the morning, behold "they were all dead corpses."

a 1 Jn. v. 16. Hebr. vi. 4.—6. x. 26, 27. Luke xii. 10. Mk. iii. 29. Matt. xii. 32.
b xx. 48.
c Jer. viii 20.

Many of the above threats were directed against the Jewish nation. It was on that unbelieving and disobedient people, that God said he would have no mercy; they were the sinners who were to suffer in unquenchable fire. This fact Mr. Winchester thinks very important to his cause; because there are abundant prophecies, (some of which are uttered in close connexion with the above threatenings,[a]) that this people shall hereafter be revived. On this account he thinks himself no loser by admitting that these menaces were executed. His words are the following, viz. "Now these threat-"enings were surely executed; for the people did not hear-"ken to God: he did certainly kindle a fire, and it burnt "and was not quenched, but consumed Jerusalem and all her "palaces; and the beautiful forests that were so much es-"teemed shared the same fate: but what person will argue "that the whole city and country must be now in flames; "and must have been consuming, from the days of Jere-"miah and Ezekiel, because of these expressions, 'the "flaming flame shall not be quenched,' &c. since we know "that Jerusalem, and the country round about, have been "since inhabited, and will be again, in a more glorious man-"ner than ever?"[b]

This argument of Mr. Winchester seems to take it for granted that the above threatenings were chiefly, if not solely directed against irrational and inanimate objects; and that when these were destroyed, the prophecy was fully accomplished, and there was no further call for divine judgments. But did he really believe that these menaces were aimed at none but forests, fields, and palaces? Are not those men who traverse these forests, cultivate these fields, and inhabit these palaces, often expressly mentioned, and always intended, as the real objects of these threatenings? Did Jehovah ever marry or divorce these inanimate creatures? Did he ever condemn them as sinners? or was the fire which consumed them unquenchable? Mr. Winchester himself did not believe that the destruction of buildings, trees, and fruits, was a complete fulfilment of God's threatenings against iniquity. Speaking of futurity beyond the grave, he says that "all the threatenings will be fulfilled upon the finally impeni-"tent." "As they have lived and died in sin, their destruc-"tion or misery is certain."[c] This doctrine he draws from passages in which the language is fully as figurative as that

a Hos. i. 9. 10.
b Dialogue 24.
c Andrews, p. 74.

which speaks of cities and their surrounding country. The following are his own words, viz. "He saith that it is more "tolerable for *the land, that is, the inhabitants* of Sodom, in "the day of judgment, than for the cities where his gospel "was preached, and his miracles wrought, and yet the in-"habitants remained impenitent: See St. Matt. xi. 24. x. "15. St. Mk. vi. 11. St. Luke. x. 12. From all which pas-"sages it is evident that the inhabitants of Sodom will be "condemned in the day of judgment, and punished in the "lake of fire."[a] To be consistent, therefore, he should have told us that it was not only the conflagration of Jerusalem, but this lake of fire beyond the grave, to which the objects of the above threatenings were consigned.

Now did Mr. Winchester, or do any of his followers, believe that those murderous unbelieving Jews, who were cut off in their sins near two thousand years ago, and who, according to his own confession, will be sent to the lake of fire, in the day of judgment;—do they believe, that long after that period, these same unbelieving Jews are to be taken from this lake of fire to heaven, as a fulfilment of those scriptures which predict the restoration of their distant posterity to the favour of God, and the possession of Jerusalem? If *they* do not believe an absurdity, so transcendantly absurd, they ought not to expect *us* to do it. These promises relate to the restoration of those Jews who shall hereafter live and die in the faith of Christ: those threatenings condemn to unquenchable fire, their remote ancestors who lived and died in unbelief and rebellion. Could the destruction of their city extinguish the unquenchable fury of their Almighty Judge? or could the faith of their posterity avert his just indignation? They must perish through their own sins, and their posterity shall be graciously justified through that faith which is the gift of God. Thus it is easy to reconcile God's threats of eternal punishment against the city of Jerusalem and the land of Judea, with his promises of eternal happiness to the same city and land. The promise was connected with the faith of Christ, and the threat was against unbelievers.

My opponent well knows that much stress is laid upon those passages which condemn the sin against the Holy Ghost. He finds one among them, which says that the perpetrator of this crime is "*in danger of* eternal damnation." This he thinks is far from deciding that he will certainly incur this

a Dialogue 5th.

punishment. All is not lost that is in danger. But is he sure that this remark will apply here? He sometimes affects a great familiarity with the original languages. A little examination will show him that the person here spoken of is represented as not only *in danger of* eternal damnation, not only *obnoxious, liable, subject to* eternal punishment, but *deserving of* it, and *bound over to* it. That this is the force of the word in this place is evident from the words immediately preceding; where it is declared that he "hath *never* forgiveness;" and from the parallel passages which forbid us to pray for such sinners; which declare it *impossible* to renew them again into repentance; that there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation; that "it shall *not* be forgiven;" and again, that "it shall *not* be forgiven him, *neither* in this "world, *neither* in the world to come."

Strong as this language is, it is hardly stronger than that of the other passages adduced. Although they are not described as having committed the unpardonable sin, yet as they had *forsaken God*, and *burned incense unto other gods*; as they did not *hallow the Sabbath*; as they were *workers of iniquity*; and as their *sins were increased*, and persevered in, therefore their bruise, their sorrow, their wound should be *incurable*; their hope should be as the giving up of the ghost. God would *not* always strive with them; he would *not* forgive, he would *not* acquit them; he would show them *no* mercy, *no* favour; they should *not* see the Lord; they should have *no* peace, *no* rest; and yet should be able to perform *no* work, *no* device, *no* knowledge *no* wisdom, connected with salvation: they could *not* endure, and yet could *not* escape. Jehovah declared that he was *not* their God, *not* their husband; that they were *not* his wife, *not* his people; that they should *not* be delivered, *not* redeemed, *not* ransomed; that they should *not* stand in judgment, *not* in the congregation of the righteous, but with worms that should *not* die, and in fire that should *not* be quenched; on the infernal side of a gulph which could *not* be passed; where they could *not* see life; could *not* have eternal life; where they could *not* taste of the Master's supper; but should drink of the cup of God's wrath *without* mixture, have judgment *without* mercy, and destruction *without* remedy.

No wonder that those who, in defiance of all these scriptural negations, deny the absolute eternity of the sinner's punishment, deny also the plenary inspiration of the bible.

FIFTH ORTHODOX ARGUMENT.

AFFIRMATION.

It is proposed to prove the absolute eternity of the sinners punishment, by passages of scripture in which this doctrine is affirmed. This affirmation may be in two forms of expression; the one declaring the *state* of the damned, the other declaring the *duration* of their punishment. To say that an Hebrew bondman had his ear bored, is the same as saying that he was to be a servant for life;—to affirm that a young *religieuse* has taken the veil, is precisely equivalent to an affirmation that she is to be immured for life;—so, those scriptures which assert that the wicked are cast into *hell*, and those which assert that they are bound over to *eternal* damnation, are equivalent to each other. Although one class of texts points out more expressly the *state* of the damned, and the other class more expressly the *duration* of their punishment, it shall, with the help of God, be shewn that they both *affirm* the solemn truth that the sufferings of these unbelievers are absolutely eternal. These things may now be considered in their order.

I.

THE STATE OF THE DAMNED.

That there is a hell, and that the finally impenitent have their portion there, is a matter of plain revelation. "Whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of *hell*-fire." "But he knoweth not that the dead are there; and that her "guests are in the depths of *hell*." "Her house is the way "to *hell*, going down to the chambers of death." "Her feet "go down to death, her steps take hold on *hell*." "But I will "forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear him, which, after "he hath killed, hath power to cast into *hell*. Yea I say unto "you, fear him." "And fear not them which kill the body, "but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him, which "is able to destroy both soul and body in *hell*." "God spared "not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to *hell*, and "delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto "judgment." "The wicked shall be turned into *hell*, and all "the nations that forget God." "Let death seize upon them, "and let them go down quick into *hell*." "Therefore *hell* "hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure: and their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, "and he that rejoiceth, shall descend into it." "It is better "for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands,

"to go into *hell*, into the fire that never shall be quenched." "And in *hell*, he lifted up his eyes, being in torments;" between which and the happiness of heaven, there was an impassable gulph. Well might our Saviour then ask, "how can ye escape the damnation of *hell*?"[a]

An Universalist polemic has a ready answer to all these authorities. He tells you that our translators have here used the word *hell* to render four distinct words in the original, neither of which denotes a state of eternal punishment. These four words *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Gehenna*, and *Tartarus*, are so innocent in their view, that they form the scenes of their most protracted and delightful literary excursions. On them alone, Mr. Balfour has written a volume of four hundred and forty-one pages octavo. The size of the book does not astonish those who have waded through its pendantie lore and tiresome tautology. By these means, and by the greater use of irrelevant extracts from other authors, (a practice with which he is acquainted) he might enlarge it indefinitely; and the admiration of certain readers might keep pace with its growth.

It is confessed that his voluminous extracts from Dr. Geo: Campbell of Aberdeen, are relevant, though not always correct. The career of this great man is not an enviable one. The pride of originality, and the lust of praise led him frequently astray. For fear of being esteemed a servile follower of the orthodoxy of his fathers, he became the dupe of the erroneous. Under the promise of liberty, they reduced him to slavery: and their subsequent treatment has been like that of Pharaoh to the Israelites, or the devil to Eve. Because he would not renounce every particle of the truth, and shew them the hundredth favour, they would not thank him for the ninety-nine. The following is Mr. Balfour's character of this accommodating scholar, viz. "It should be "kept in remembrance, that Dr. Campbell was a very cele- "brated minister of the church of Scotland, and Principal of "Marischal College, Aberdeen. The most learned, yea, the "very best of men, are liable to be influenced by the places "of honour and emolument they occupy. There is no doubt "in my mind, that had Dr. Campbell written in a situation "free of all restraint, he would have given us a very differ- "ent account of Gehenna and its punishment. The doctrine

---

a Matt. v. 22. Prov. ix. 18. vii. 27. v. 5, Luke xii. 6. Matt. x. 28. 2 Pet. ii. 4. Ps. ix. 17. lv. 15. Mk. ix. 43. Luke xvi. 23. Matt. xxiii. 33.

"of eternal misery, was a principal article in the creed he "was obliged to subscribe to, and by which he held his "place and all its emoluments: It is rather a matter of sur-"prise that he ventured to write so much at variance with this "doctrine, considering the time he lived, and circumstan-"ces in which he was placed."[a]

This is the reward which Dr. Campbell has generally received for those servile compliances, which he vainly imagined, constituted the essence of independence. He is here represented as an Universalist in heart, while a Presbyterian by a solemn profession. His place of honour and emolument is here given as his reason for being a Presbyterian; and it was only the love of filthy lucre that kept him from professing an opposite system of religion. But what must we think of the morality of Universalism, when we are told by its champion, that "the very best of men are liable to be influenced by" such motives? And let it be remembered that this is no hasty or novel concession; for these Universalist Unitarians claim Locke, Newton, and a host of worthies, while allowing that they were guilty of the same inconsistency. But must not that be the synagogue of Satan, in whose eyes the avaricious and deceitful, liars and perjured persons, are "the very best of men!"

Dr. Campbell's example and reward should be an instructive lesson to those who are beset with his temptations. They would persuade you to deny or conceal the doctrines of original sin and natural inability, and the doctrines of particular election and redemption. They will then represent you as in the high road to fame. The mead of flattery is pleasant: they perceive that it is relished by you: they see you advancing in error: their mouths are open for a burst of applause, upon your next step towards destruction. You make another effort to please; and completely succeed, by asserting that God has uttered threats, which never were executed, and never will be executed, either on the actual offender, or on his surety, If they were pleased with your advocating an universal atonement, which according to the scriptures, would secure an universal salvation; they are more pleased with your adding to this, a virtual denial of God's faithfulness and justice, which would for ever secure them from the fear of damnation. Although this doctrine was preached in Eden, before the fall of man, by a superhuman intelligence, your seducers will give you the praise of originality, and extra-

a Chap. ii. Sec. 1.

ordinary intellectual vigour. You are now a man of an independent spirit: you have escaped from the shackles of parental example; of human authority, of sectarianism, superstition and bigotry. By this time you have a juster sense of your own importance. You clearly perceive the vast superiority of your attainments, over those of the Westminster Assembly, the Synod of Dort, the Reformers, and Augustine; although in reality, not fit to be placed with the dogs of their flocks. If the Rubicon is not *already* past, only one step remains to do it: Deny all imputation; not only the imputation of Christ's righteousness to his people; not only the transfer of Adam's guilt to his posterity; but the imputation of our sins to Christ. Quote to them the beginning of Ezekiel xviii, and shew that the law does not admit of a substitute. Then give up all hopes from the orthodox, and "make an agreement with me by a present, and come out "to me: and eat ye every one of his vine; and every one of his "fig-tree, and drink ye every one the waters of his own "cistern; until I come and take you away to a land like "your own land, a land of corn and wine, a land of bread "and vineyards."[a] But if you refuse to take the two last steps above mentioned, and all the others which are consequent upon them;—if you prefer remaining in that church to whose creed you have sworn,—remember, that although we may praise you, while living, for that portion of error which you have received, we shall, after your death, place you with "the very best of men," such as Dr. Campbell, and Judas and Esau; all of whom sold their birthrights for a mess of pottage. When such a man dies, his own flatterers precede the Orthodox in blasting his fame. "The me-"mory of the just is blessed: but the name of the wicked "shall rot."[b]

But it is time to examine the amount of Dr. Campbell's authority, and the use, or rather the abuse which has been made of it by the Universalists. My opponent asserts that Dr. Cambell has "given up all but the term *Gehenna*, as a "place of future punishment for the wicked." He gives it as Dr. Campbell's avowed belief that *hades* and *sheol* "have "no reference whatever to a state of punishment after "death."[c] Mr. Balfour, in speaking of Dr. Campbell's observations upon the "place of torment for the wicked," says; "He denies that it is called by the names *Sheol, Hades*, or

a Is. xxxvi, 16, 17.
b Prov. x. 7.
c Minutes, p. 176.

"*Tartarus*: yea, he denies that the Hebrew, Greek, or En-"glish languages, afford a name for this place of torment."[a] This goes even farther than my opponent; and denies that Dr. Campbell believed any of these four names, even *Gehenna* itself, to denote the place of torment. This may seem astonishing to those who are informed, that only three pages before this extravagant assertion, he had quoted and censured the Doctor's declaration to the contrary, concerning *Gehenna*; and in a distant part of the same work,[b] he says "that he denies that *Hades* is the place of eternal punishment; and that he contends for *Gehenna* being this place." Could it be expected that only four pages before this, he had quoted Dr. Campbell's own words, in which he declared the contrary? The passage is as follows, viz: "But is there not one passage, it may be said, in which the word *Hades* must be understood as synonymous with *Gehenna*, and consequently must denote the place of final punishment prepared for the wicked, or *Hell* in the Christian acceptation of the term? Ye have it in the story of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 23, '*In Hell*, εν τω αδη, *he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.*' This is the only passage in Holy Writ which seems to give countenance to the opinion that *hades* sometimes means the same thing as *gehenna*. Here it is represented as a place of punishment. The rich man is said to be tormented there in the midst of flames."

Thus does the favourite author of the Universalists bear testimony against them. He declares that in this important passage, the word *Hades* denotes "the place of final punish-"ment prepared for the wicked, or *Hell*, in the Christian ac-"ceptation of the term:" and let it be marked, that he believed this *Hell*, this *Hades*, this *Gehenna*, to be a place of absolutely eternal punishment; which belief is proved to be correct by the passage quoted above. This point being established, there is a strong probability, if not a certainty, that *Sheol* also, signifies the place of everlasting punishment, since the Septuagint generally renders *sheol* by *hades*; and it is acknowldged by both parties, that they are synonymous. In speaking of *Sheol*, Campbell says that "in trans-"lating that word, the Seventy have almost invariably used "*Hades*." The same fact has been stated by my opponent in the very same words.[c] Mr. Balfour says that "*Sheol* and

a Chap. ii. Sec. 1.
b Chap. i. Sec. 3.
c Minutes, p. 135.

"*Hades* are only the Greek and Hebrew names for the same "place."[a]

The fact that these two words, occurring in the Old and New Testaments, are synonymous, after the meaning of one of them is thus fairly settled, proves that the doctrine of a future state is common to both dispensations. This, though denied by my opponent, is admitted by Mr. Balfour. The following are his words, viz: "That both future existence and "the resurrection of the dead, were in some degree known "under the old dispensation, we think can be proved." For proof of this, he refers to several scriptures.[b] He also gives an extract from *Jahn's Biblical Aarchæology*, in which, scripture is produced to prove "reception into the presence of God at death."[d] The adoption of the question under discussion, would indicate that my opponent believes in a separate existence of the soul from the body, as Mr. Balfour does. But in your presence, and elsewhere, he has proved himself a Materialist. He not only denies that the Old Testament reveals a future state, but that either the old or New Testament contains the doctrine of an intermediate state. It is not my design, however, to notice these questions, at present, except as they are merged in the argument which is now in hand; in the prosecution of which it becomes necessary to examine, as concisely as possible, the meaning of the inspired words, *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Gehenna*, and *Tartarus*, in the order in which they are here placed.

I.

SHEOL.

Mr. Balfour has already told us that this word occurs sixty-four times in the Hebrew Bible. Those who will take the trouble to examine them with the aid of a concordance, will probably find the following account to be correct.

(1.) In two passages it appears to signify the grave. "Like sheep they are laid in *Sheol*." Our bones are scattered at the mouth of *Sheol*.[d]

(2.) There are three passages, in which it appears to embrace the interment of the body, and the final condition of the soul. Korah, Dathan, and Abiram are said to "go down alive into *Sheol*." "They and all that appertained to them, went down alive into *Sheol*." Solomon makes the robber

a Chap. i. Sec. 2.
b Mark xii. 26, 27. Heb. xith Chap.
c Hag. 2. 23, Eccl. 12, 7.
d Balfour, Chap. ii. Sec. 6. Chap. i. Sec. 1.
d Ps. 49; 14; 141; 7.

say, "Let us swallow them up alive as *Sheol*, and whole as "those that go down into the pit."[a]

(3.) There are five places, in which it seems to exclude the interment of the body. This does not appear from three of them, in which Jacob's gray hairs are represented as brought down with sorrow to *sheol*; except by a comparison with a fourth, in which he expected to find in *sheol*, his son Joseph, whom he believed to have been devoured by wild beasts, and of course, not be in the grave. The fifth is the one in which Jonah is said to cry to God "out of the belly of *sheol*."[b] and of course not out of the grave.

(4.) There are 13 other places in which, without stopping to discuss the subject I humbly conceive it signifies the intermediate state of all the dead, saints and sinners. I shall simply refer to the texts.[c] This *sheol*, or state of separation, must come to an end; because at the resurrection, the souls and bodies of men must be reunited.

(5.) There are two instances, in which it evidently means the separate state of the happy dead. "O that thou wouldst hide me in *sheol!* that thou wouldst keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldst appoint me a set time and remember me." "For thou wilt not leave my soul in *sheol*, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see crorupion." As the soul of the Redeemer, after the crucifixion, went to Paradise, this is the *sheol* here mentioned; and there it was that Job wished to be hid.[d]

(6.) Although in the passages referred to, under number four, this word appears to embrace heaven and hell, until the resurrection; there are six places in which it denotes the latter in contrast with the former. Concerning God's omniscience, Job says, "It is as high as heaven, what canst thou do? deeper than *sheol*, what canst thou know?" The Psalmist says, "If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there, if I make my bed in *sheol*, behold thou art there." "Solomon says, "the way of life is above to the wise, that he may depart from *sheol* beneath." "Moreover the Lord spake unto Ahaz, saying, ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God; ask it either in *sheol*, or in the height above." "Though they dig into *sheol*, thence shall mine hand take them; though

---

a Numb. xvi. 30, 33. Prov. i. 12.
b Gen. 42; 38, 44; 31, 29. Jonah 2; 2.
c 1 Sam. 2; 6. Job, 7; 9, 17; 13, 16, 26; 6. Ps. 6; 5, 88; 3, 89; 48. Eccl. 9; 10. Is. 38; 18. Hos. 13; 14. 2 Isa. Hab. 2; 5.
d Job, 14; 13. Ps. 16; 10.

they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down."[a]

(7.) There are eleven places in addition to the nine mentioned in numbers two and six above, in which it is *probably* used to denote the place of future punishment. "Let "not his hoar head go down to *sheol* in peace." "Nor[b] his "hoar head bring thou down to *sheol* with blood." "O "Lord! thou hast brought up my soul from *sheol*: thou hast "kept me alive that I should not go down to the pit." Here is a *synonimous parallel*, in which the latter clause of the verse explains the meaning of the former. "His soul was virtually brought up from hell, by his being delivered from the power of the devil, and preserved from going to the pit. "Thy pomp is brought down to *sheol*." "*Sheol* from beneath "is moved for thee, to meet thee at thy coming." As our Saviour speaks of the rich man's sufferings in another world, while his body was in the grave, so the body of this fallen hero is represented as covered with worms, while yet his soul, and the souls of "all the chief ones of the earth," "all "the kings of the nations," are in the exercise of a sort of activity and intelligence, and suffering under degradation and punishment in another world. Again, the prophet threatens him, "Yet thou shalt be brought down to *sheol*, to the sides of the pit." That this is not the grave, but a place of future punishment, will appear from Job xxxiii. 24, where deliverance from going down to this *pit*, is said to be the end of Christ's *gracious* interposition, as a *Ransom* or *Atonement*; (as it is in the margin.) Now the atonement does preserve *from going down to* Hell, but not *from going down to* the grave. "We have made a covenant with death and with *sheol* are we at agreement." "Your covenant "with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with "*sheol* shall not stand." "I said, in the cutting off of my "days, I shall go to the gates of *sheol*." "For *sheol* can-"not praise thee; death cannot celebrate thee: they that "go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth."[c]

(8.) There are 25 places in which *sheol* is *certainly* used for *hell*, in the Christian sense of the word. Moses, in speaking of men, under the figures of *the earth* and *the mountains*, (language familiar to the scriptures,)[d] says, "For a fire is

---

a Job, 11; 8. Ps. 139; 8. Prov. 15,24. Is. 7. 11; Am. 9. 2.

b This is the true force of the ו in this and some other passages.

c 1 Kgs. ii. 6, 9. Ps. xxx. 3. Is. xiv. 9. 11. 15. 23. 15. 18. 38. 10.

d See Deut. xxxii. 1. Ps. xcvi. 1. 11. 1 Chr. xvi. 31. 33. Is. ii. 2, 41. 15. Ez. vi. 2.

"kindled in mine anger and shall burn unto the lowest *sheol*, "and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on "fire the foundations of the mountains."[a] David says, "thou "hast delivered my soul from the lowest *sheol*;"[b] and the same writer says again, "The sorrows of *sheol* compassed "me about; the snares of death prevented me:"[c] and again, "The sorrows of death compassed me, and the pains of "*sheol* gat hold upon me: I found trouble and sorrow."[d] After quoting this text, my opponent speaks as follows, viz. "We there find the Psalmist declaring that 'the pains of hell' "had actually got hold of him. Now if the pains of hell "*had* actually got hold of him, will it do to say that he re-"turned thanks to God that he had preserved him from going "into hell, or that he had not been there ?"[e] In reply, I would observe that this reasoning of my opponent proves too much, and therefore will avail him nothing. The text in question has several clauses. In the first the Psalmist says, "The sorrows of death compassed me." In the second he says, "the pains of hell gat hold upon me." Now if the second clause prove that he was in hell, does not the first prove that he died before he went thither? In answer to this question, my opponent has expressly declared, that "the "*sorrows* of death are all experienced and felt, before death "actually takes place."[f] This is true: but it is no less true, that the pains of hell gat hold upon him, before he was actually sent to hell. These three texts are all tantamount to Ps. xxx. 3, noticed in No. 7, above, in which the latter line of the distich explains the former: "O Lord! thou "hast brought up my soul from *sheol*: thou hast kept me "alive, that I should not go down to the pit." The same interpretation is to be applied to Solomon's instruction for the correction of a child: "Thou shalt beat him with the "rod, and shalt deliver his soul from *sheol*."[g] The Psalmist says, "Let death seize upon them, and let them go down "quick into *sheol*: for wickedness is in their dwellings and "and among them."[h] Concerning the impure of both sexes, Solomon says, "But he knoweth not that the dead are there,

---

a Deut. xxxii. 22.
b Ps. lxxxvi. 13.
c 2 Sam. xxii. 6. & Ps. xviii. 5.
d Ps. cxvi. 3.
e Minutes p. cxli.
f Little yellow covered sermon, published in 1824, p. 24.
g Prov. xxiii. 14.
h Ps. lv. 15.

"and that her guests are in the depths of *sheol*." "Her feet "go down to death; her steps take hold on *sheol*." These passages are explained by another which, says, "Her "house is the way to *sheol*; going down to the chambers of "death."[a] To such characters Isaiah says, "thou" "didst "debase thy self even unto *sheol*."[b] Whether this hell was before or after death, may be learned from Ezekiel who says of a certain character, "he went down to *sheol*." "I cast "him down to *sheol*, with them that descend into the pit." "They also went down into *sheol* with him, unto them that "be slain with the sword." "The strong among the migh-"ty shall speak to him out of the midst of *sheol* with them "that help him: they are gone down, they lie uncircumcis-"ed, slain by the sword." "And they shall not lie with the "mighty that are fallen of the uncircumcised, which are "gone down to *sheol*, with their weapons of war: and they "have laid their swords under their heads, but their iniqui-"ties shall be upon their bones, though they were the terror "of the mighty in the land of the living."[c] That this hell was not before death, is evident, because the subjects of it, though formerly "in the land of the living," were "slain with the sword," before they went to hell. That *sheol* here means something more than the interment of the body, appears from their speaking to one another out of the midst of *sheol*, as did the rich man and Lazarus. They had vainly expected that by laying their swords under their heads in the grave, they should take their weapons of war with them to *sheol*. Contempt is here thrown upon this expectation, by ironically asserting its truth. Instead of this, however, it is declared that "their iniquities, or the punishment of their ini-"quities, shall be upon their bones." This shews that they were in torment with the rich man, whose iniquity was upon his tongue. With a view to the reception of many such characters, Isaiah says, "*Sheol* hath enlarged herself, and open-"ed her mouth without measure: and their glory, and their "multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth, shall des-"cend into it."[d] The Restitutionists say that this mouth which is opened without measure, shall one day be satisfied. But "*sheol*" is declared by Solomon, to be one of those things that say, "it is not enough."[e] They and the Des-

a Prov. ix. 18. v. 5. vii. 27.
b Is. lvii. 9.
c Ez. xxxi. 15—17. 32. 21. 27.
d Is. v. 14.
e Prov. xxx. 16.

tructionists think that after "*Sheol* hath enlarged herself," she will nevertheless become superannuated, and die. This is correct, when applied to number four above. There will, at the resurrection, be a re-union of the souls and the bodies of men, and therefore a state of separation will be forever at an end. Thus *sheol*, in that sense, may be said to be "old and *full* of days," or *satisfied* with living, as Moses says Isaac was, when he was gathered to his people, and his sons buried him. But although *sheol*, a state of separation, will be *full* of days; sheol, a state of *destruction*, never will be *full*. Solomon says, "*Sheol* and *destruction* are never *full*: "so the eyes of man are never *satisfied*."[a] If this destruction meant annihilation, then Solomon would not have said, "*Sheol* and *destruction* are before the Lord."[b] If those who go to *sheol*, are to be annihilated, then that is the very city of refuge, to which God's incorrigible enemies would flee, after they have called in vain for the rocks and mountains to fall upon them, and hide them from his presence. But in Ps. cxxxix: 7, mentioned in number six, above; David says, "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in *sheol*, behold thou art there."[c] Dr. Campbell says, "It is plain that in the Old Testa-"ment, the most profound silence is observed in regard to "the state of the deceased, their joys, or sorrows, happiness "or misery;" that *sheol* "is *always* represented under those "figures which suggest something dreadful, dark and *silent*." In making these remarks, he probably had his eye, upon such passages as that in which David says, "Let the wick-"ed be ashamed, and let them be *silent* in *sheol*."[d] But let it be recollected that this great man declined the "enumera-"tion and examination of all the passages in both Testa-"ments wherein the word is found," as an *endless* task. If he had examined Ez. xxxii. 21, quoted above, in which a heathen is represented as speaking "out of the midst of *sheol*," would he have said that this was "*always* represented" as *silent*? The truth is, it is sometimes represented in one light and sometimes in the other. Its silence denotes dismay, and its utterance is the language of persevering impiety, and hopeless importunity; weeping, wailing, and gnashing of

a Prov. xxvii. 20.
b Prov. xv. 11.

c In. No. 6. this is among the *contrasts*, in No. 7, it is recognised as a *probable*. it might be justly added to those which are deemed *certain*.

d Ps. xxxi. 17.

teeth. Between these two representations there is no inconsistency. Precisely the same diversity occurs in our Saviour's representations of the day of judgment; as they are found in Matt. xxii. 11—13, and xxv. 41—46. In one of these passages the convict is represented as "speechless;" in the other, as justifying himself. But in both cases, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, they are sent to deserved punishment; for "the wicked shall be turned into *sheol*, and "all the nations that forget God."[a] From this all their honours and pleasures cannot preserve them. Though they were "clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day;" they are liable at any moment, to have it said to them, "thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee." "They spend their days in wealth, and in a moment go down to *sheol*."[b] Though in this world they were protected from the heat, by tents of state, and roofs of cedar, by refreshing air and every healthful and exhilarating potion, it shall be far otherwise there. "Drought and heat "consume the snow waters: so doth *sheol* those which have "sinned."[c] Although God is not cruel but just, in thus consuming them for ever, without the possibility of annihilation or restitution, Solomon calls their state of punishment *cruel*, on account of the intensity and the duration of their torments. "Jealousy[d] is *cruel* as *sheol*. The coals thereof are coals of fire, which hath a most vehement flame."[e] Thus did the rich man in the gospel find it. If his torment be *sorrow* and *misery*, then the Old Testament is not silent on this subject, as Dr. Campbell has, without examination, asserted it to be.

2.

HADES.

We are already informed by Mr. Balfour, "that the word "Hades is only used eleven times in the New Testament. "It is rendered in the common version once *grave*, and in all the other ten places, by the word *hell*."[f] Two of these passages are the same declaration of our Saviour, reported by two Evangelists. "And thou Capernaum! which art exalted to heaven, shalt be thrust down to *hades*."[g] This is tantamount to a denunciation of the prophet Obadiah against

a Ps. ix. 17.
b Job, xxi. 13.
c Job, xxiv. 19.
d That is, the jealousy of God, as in the second commandment.
e Cant. viii. 6.
f Chap. i. Sec. 2.
g Matt. xi. 23. Luke x. 15.

Edom. "Though thou exalt thyself as the eagle, and though thou set thy nest among the stars, thence will I bring thee down, saith the Lord." In the verse immediately preceding, the prophet informs us that this exaltation of the Edomites to the stars was in their own conceit. "The pride of thy heart hath deceived thee." They thought their fortress in the rock, to be the summit of safety; but God threatens their downfall. So the people of Capernaum thought that they had attained the pinnacle of prosperity, and that their happiness was to be permanent. But Christ lets them know that their fall shall be as low as their imaginary elevation was exalted. What divine justice threatened, divine faithfulness doubtless executed.

There are four instances in which *hades* appears to denote the state of separate spirits, whose bodies are in the grave. Peter quotes David's prophecy concerning Christ's resurrection, and the consequent re-union of his human soul and body; "thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*, nor suffer thine holy one to see corruption." The Apostle then adds. "His soul was not left in *hades*, neither his flesh did see corruption."[a] As Christ's vicarious and law-satisfying death removes the sting of his people's death; so his resurrection is a victory over *hades*, by securing the happy re-union of the souls and bodies of his people. Therefore the Spirit says, "O death! where is thy sting? O *hades*! where is thy victory?"[b] The divine Jesus asserts his victory, when addressing John at Patmos: "I am the First and the Last: I "am He that liveth and was dead; and behold! I am alive for "evermore, Amen; and have the keys of *hades* and of death."[c] In some of these passages, as also in Hos. xiii. 14. the state of eternal punishment may be intended; though I cannot see any reason for supposing that the word *grave* is a correct translation, unless the general place of departed spirits be intended by this word, as is sometimes the case.

In the five remaining instances, as in the two first, mentioned above, it is intended to point out the *place* of torment, or the *inhabitants* of that world of woe. When our Saviour says, "the gates of *hades* shall not prevail against"[d] his church, I understand him as referring to the *inhabitants* of hell, especially those who were high in command: for such characters usually occupied the gates of Jerusalem, and oth-

a Acts, ii. 27 31.
b 1 Cor. xv. 55
c Rev. i. 18.
d Matt. xvi. 18.

er cities. Job "went out to the gate." "Mordacai came before the king's gate." David the king "went up to the chamber over the gate." Isaiah says to the officers of government and the people at large, "Howl, O gate! cry, O city! thou, whole Palestina, art dissolved," "In the city is "left desolation, and the gate is smitten with destruction;" that is, there is desolation among the people, and destruction among their rulers. Thus the gates of their enemies prevailed against them. But concerning the church, Christ says, "the gates of *hades*," that is the devil and his legions, "shall not prevail against it."

Although the devil and his legions shall never prevail against the church, they are said to destroy many of the human race. "And I looked, and behold a pale horse: and his name "that sat on him was Death, and *Hades* followed with him. "And power was given unto them over the fourth part of "the earth, to kill with sword, and with hunger, and with "death, and with the beasts of the earth."[a] As *Sheol* is sometimes connected with the *word destruction*, so *Hades* is here connected with the *work* of *destruction*: and let it be observed that it is mentioned as *following* death, not *preceding* it;—as following *with* death, not waiting until the general resurrection. As soon as the sinner dies, his soul enters the place of torment, as the soul of the believer enters Paradise. The effect of the resurrection and the general judgment is, to re-unite their bodies to their souls, and increase their misery or their bliss. When the souls of the wicked are separated from their bodies, and cast into the lake of fire, where the rich man's soul was tormented, while his body was in the grave, this is the first death. When this separation ceases and their souls and bodies are punished together in this lake of fire, this is called the second death. "And the "sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and *hades* "delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were "judged every man according to their works. And death "and *hades* were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second "death."[b] Many millions of sinners have perished in the sea; especially in the general deluge, when there was nothing but sea.[c] These dead bodies are to be delivered up. But many millions of sinners have perished on the land, intended by "*death*" in the text. These dead bodies also shall be delivered up at the resurrection. All the souls belonging to

a Rev. vi. 8.
b Rev. xx. 13, 14.
c See Horseley, on Christ's descent into Hell.

these bodies are in *hades*, with the rich man. Therefore it is said "*hades* delivered up the dead," that is, the souls which were in it. "And they were judged every man according to "their works. And [after the judgment,] *death*, [that is, "their bodies, which were once dead,] and *hades*, [that is, "their souls, which were before in the lake without their "bodies,] were cast into the lake of fire [together.] This is "the second death." I know that the whole tribe of Universalists, who believe the devil a mere personification, pretend also that *death* and *hades*, in this text, are mere personifications or nonentities: and they would wisely teach us, that these nonentities are cast into the lake of fire, that they may be more completely *nonentified*. To call this a second death or a first death either, would be strange indeed, since there is nothing to die! Mr. Hume could have saved them this trouble, by proving that *sinners* are nonentities. But if it be true, that God is a real being, and a just judge;—and if it be true that the devil and the devil's children have a real existence, then it is also true that "Tophet is ordained of "old; yea, for the king it is prepared: he hath made it deep "and large: the pile thereof is fire and much wood; the "breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kin-"dle it." What could the Prophet mean here, by that fiery *Tophet*, prepared for the king, and kindled by the breath of an angry God, but that "everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels," into which the wicked are to be driven by the breath of the Lord, in the sentence of condemnation, at the day of judgment?

The only remaining instance in which the New Testament gives the name of *hades* to this state of punishment, is in the case of the rich man. "And in *hades*, he lifted up his eyes, being in torments."[a] This has been correctly referred to, in support of my five arguments severally. This case shews the *helplessness of the sinner*, and the consequent impossibility of his restitution from hell: "They which would "pass from hence to you, *cannot*; *neither can* they pass to us "that would come from thence." From these words their state must be eternally fixed; and there is as great a *contrast* between the eternal destiny of the one, and that of the other, as between heaven and hell. In these words it is also plainly *denied* that their condition ever will or can be changed. As a reason for this it is *affirmed* that he is in *hades*, in torments; that is, he is in *hell*, the place of eternal punish-

a Luke xvi. 23.

ment. That which is affirmed in one verse, is also plainly *implied* in another; where "Abraham said, son, remember "that thou, in thy life time, receivedst thy good things, and "likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted and "thou art tormented." My opponent would make you believe that *hell* is in this life, and that it is to be seen and experienced in scenes of revelry and debauchery: but we are here informed that *in this life*, the rich man received his comforts, and his good things; and his *hell* was, to lift up his affrighted eyes, and to utter his unavailing cries, in a tormenting flame, after he was dead and buried.

It is with reluctance, I confess, that the quibbling of Mr. Balfour and my opponent about his being on a *level* with Lazarus, is here noticed. The former speaks as follows, viz: "Whatever place *hades* is, in which the rich man is here re-"presented as in torment, it is very evident that Abraham "and Lazarus were also in *hades*. Though spoken of as at "some distance from each other, yet they were within sight "and hearing, and could converse together. The one is not "represented as in heaven, and the other in hell: no; they "are represented as in the same place, and on a *level* with "each other."[a] In addition to this, if I mistake not, my opponent has endeavoured to prove this level by means of the gulph which was fixed between them: understanding by this gulph, a body of water, which, of course, seeks its level. "In fact," says he, "the whole scene is laid upon a plain, "which was supposed to be under ground; every word in the "original, signifying *motion*, implies that the places each side "of the gulph, were on a level with each other; there is not "one word which conveys the idea of *ascending* or of *de-"scending*, but every expression implies distance, and not "height nor depth."[b]

In answer to these sage remarks, I would ask, was it not strange for the rich man, lying near a vast body of water, to ask a man on the other side of it, to bring him one drop? But stop: this body of water was not so large, for they could converse across it. Of course, it must have been navigable by a canoe. Why then did Abraham call it impassable? But why should they wish to pass it? These gentlemen have proved that they were in the same place; in the same state, although they had the gulph between them, and although they were afar off from each other. Is it true that two peo-

a Chap. i. Sec. 2.
b Minutes p. 135.

ple cannot speak to each other on the river which is near us, without being in the same vessel, and without being on a level? Cannot one man from the top of a seventy-four, address another in the bottom of a wherry? and must Pennsylvania and Jersey be the same state, because they can both be seen across the Delaware? But there is one word signifying *motion*, which appears to have escaped the notice of my opponent. "In *hell* he *lifted up* his eyes." Does this imply that he gave them a horizontal direction? What did he mean just now, when he told you that he had been informed of a general rumour through the city, last evening, that my cause was looking up? Did he mean that it was thought to be on a level with his? Let it therefore be remembered that unless we can reconcile palpable absurdities, then there is not one iota of evidence to prove that Lazarus and the rich man were in the same place. Their seeing and speaking will not prove it, unless we are acquainted with the organs of separate spirits. The contrary conclusion should be drawn from the express words of scripture. The one was "in hell," and the other "afar off;" the one was "in torments," and the other "in Abraham's bosom." If torment and comfort are the same thing, and heaven and hell the same place, then the rich man and Lazarus were in the same state.

It has already been shewn, that my opponent and his coadjutors consider this passage of scripture a parable; and a parable, they think, can, with a little ingenuity, be made to mean any thing or nothing. When it is most convenient, they scruple not to make glaring insinuations, that what they call parables, contain falsehoods. But let us see what they have done in the elucidation of this parable, as they would have it to be. Mr. Ballou in his "Notes on the Parables,"[a] makes the rich man to stand for the Aaronic High Priest, and the pious beggar for the Gentiles. The death of Lazarus, means the conversion of the Gentiles, and the death of the rich man the close of the Mosaic dispensation. His being in hades, means conviction of sin, and his seeing the beggar in Abraham's bosom, means his witnessing the conversion of the Gentiles to Abraham's faith. My opponent agrees with this interpretation, and thinks that he makes a slight improvement by interpreting "Abraham and his bosom, the gospel dispensation."[b] As those who are run mad for alle-

a Parable 38.
b Lectures p 202. Note.

gory, can never be satisfied with a parable, until they have taught it to go on all-fours, my opponent has spared no pains in inquiring after the rich man's five brethren. If he has, at different times, had different opinions upon this subject, it is an error to which all great men are liable, in such important pursuits.

Previous to his debate with Mr. Bishop, in the Northern Liberties, he delivered a popular sermon, in which he is said to have used the following words, viz: "any man of sense, or "common understanding, must know, that, by the five breth-"ren, is to be understood the five books of Moses."[a] By the same authority, we are publicly informed, (and I believe, without contradiction) that my opponent has since relinquished that interpretation, which he said that "any man of sense or common understanding, must" adopt; and has very complaisantly fallen in with Mr. Ballou's opinion, that the five brethren are the same as the five foolish virgins. This is evidently an improvement; and goes to shew that this is an age of improvement. The first interpretation was, I think myself, a little exceptionable; as there was evidently no more reason, for believing that these five brethren meant the five books of Moses, than that it meant certain five *Canaanizing* cities in the land of Egypt;[b] or the five changes of raiment which Joseph gave to Benjamin;[i] or the five porches of the pool of Bethesda;[c] or the five barley loaves which fed so many thousands.[d] To make them mean the five books of Moses, is as arbitrary, as to make them figurative of the five horses which were sent to the Syrian camp;[e] or of the five rams, five he-goats, and the five lambs, which Nashon, the son of Aminidab offered "for a sacrifice of peace-offering;"[f] or the five sparrows that were sold for two farthings;[g] or the five golden emrods, and the five golden mice, which the Philistines offered for a trespass offering."[h] I think, therefore, upon mature deliberation, that my opponent was right in discarding this scheme, although, in doing so, he is stigmatized by his former declaration, as a man destitute of "sense or common understanding."

a See Mr. G. Bishop's "Public Controversy," published in Philadelphia, A.D. 1822, p. 148. Note.
b Is. xix. 18.
c John v. 2.
d John vi. 9.
e 2 Kings vii. 13.
f Numb. vii. 17.
g Luke xii. 6.
h 1 Sam. vi. 4.
i Gen. xlv. 22.

It has already been admitted that making these five brethren to mean the five foolish virgins instead of the five books of Moses, is a real improvement. Although I am myself an advocate of the old way, and therefore unfit to engage largely in the improvements of the present day, I would modestly suggest the possibility of an improvement even upon this interpretation. Might it not be more plausible to go in search of some quintuple, of the same sex with these five brethren, as well as of the same moral character? This disagreement of sex would as effectually prevent some from identifying them with the five foolish virgins, as with Abigail's "five damsels."[a] Being driven off of this ground, we had better pass by Joseph's five brethren whom he introduced to Pharaoh,[b] and the five sons of Mical and Adriel,[c] and the five sons of Zerah,[d] as being rather doubtful characters. It is true, this would be no solid objection, if they were the only fives mentioned in scripture: but there are many others much more to the purpose; and among these we can choose that one, which will most effectually help to allegorize the rich man out of torment. Since therefore, we have determined that these five brethren do not mean the penteteuch, nor the foolish virgins, may they not mean the five husbands of the Samaritan woman?[e] or the five spies that stole Micah's Gods?[f] or the five Lords of the Philistine *Pentarchy*?[g] or the five kings of Midian, whom Moses slew?[h] or the five kings of the Amorites, whom Joshua hanged upon five trees?[i] These are unexceptionable resemblances, as to sex and character. They are as much like the five brethren, as the Universalists are like the Unitarians: and all of them, whether brethren, husbands, spies, Lords, Kings, Universalists, or Unitarians, are very much of a piece.

But after all, there is a great difference between faith and fancy; between expounding scripture, and darkening counsel by words without knowledge. I would rather, with the Apostle Paul, "speak five words with my understanding,"[j] than to form ten thousand heretical conjectures concerning these five brethren, which are intended only to smother the plain truth. This passage is plain, whether it be called history or parable. In either case, it can mean nothing less,

a 1 Sam. xxv. 42.
b Gen. lxvii 2.
c 1 Sam. xxi. 8.
d 1 Chr. ii. 6.
e Jn. iv. 18.
f Judg. xviii. 2.
g 1 Sam. vi. 16. 17.
h Num. xxxi. 8.
i Josh. x. 5. 26.
j 1 Cor. xiv. 19.

than that, immediately after death, the soul of a believer goes to the happiness of heaven, and that of an unbeliever to the torments of hell; between which two states, there is an absolutely eternal separation. The language of Abraham communicates thus much, and thus the rich man evidently understood it: for he gives up all hope of his own salvation; and asks, as his last request, that his brethren may not come thither to aggravate his torment five fold. He is not consoled with the Unsversalist salvo, that although he cannot pass the gulph himself, God can and will take him over. Instead of this, he considers the words of Abraham, as God's infallible declaration, that he never shall pass from hell to heaven, nor have his torments mitigated by one drop of comfort.

But instead of placing this impassable gulph between believers and unbelievers in the eternal world, Mr. Ballou and my opponent would place it between the Jews and Gentiles in this world! the very contrary of which is declared by the Spirit of Christ. "For he is our peace, who hath made "both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of parti-"tion between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, "even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; "for to make in himself of twain, one new man, so making "peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one "body by the cross, having slain the enmity; and came, and "preached peace to you which were afar off, [to the Gentiles,] "and to them that were nigh, [to the Jews.]"[a] What a pity, that when Christ has pulled down the wall of separation between Jews and Gentiles, the Universalists should endeavour to fix an impassable gulph between them! But the truth is, they found this gulph in their way; and they were as much at a loss to know where to put it, as they were to find accommodations for their five unbelieviug brethren; and as is often the case with prevaricating witnesses, they placed it exactly where it ought not to be.

The absurdity of this scheme is equally great in another respect. The beggar "died;" and after death, those good angels, which my opponent would consider personifications, or non-entities, carried his soul to happiness. The rich man also "died," and his body was buried; but after death, his soul was carried, by personifications of another description, to the world of torment. Although in this world he asked

a Eph. ii. 14—17.

no mercy, he calls for it there, where it cannot be found. Abraham reminds him of the condition in which he and Lazarus were placed in their "life-time," but tells them, that "now" after their death and burial, their conditions are greatly changed. To shew that they were really dead, the rich man requests that Lazarus may be sent "from the dead," and Abraham assures him that an unbeliever cannot be saved, "though one rose from the dead." In the face of this accumulated and unequivocal testimony of inspiration, the scheme which we are opposing, requires us to believe that there was no death in the case; but that this whole account relates to the transactions of this life.

You can scarcely conceive of the extent of that barbarity with which these people treat the word of God, until you make a close comparison of their views with the oracles of truth. This we shall now endeavour to do, in a paraphrase which shall incorporate the features of their interpretation, with the sacred text. This method of exposing error is used with reverence to God, and love to your souls: for consequences, let the corrupters of Revelation be answerable. The Universalist paraphrase is as follows, viz. "There was a "certain rich man [the Aaronic High Priest,] which was "clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously "every day. And there was a certain beggar, named La-"zarus, [the Gentiles,] which was laid at his gate, full of "sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell "from the rich man's table, [the High Priest's table.] "Moreover, the dogs, [the Apostles] came and licked his "sores. And it came to pass, that the beggar, [the Gentiles] "died, [became converted] and was carried by the angels "[the personifications, or non-entities, or these dogs, the "Apostles,] into Abraham's bosom, [the Gospel dispensa-"tion.] The rich man [the Aaronic High Priest,] also died, "[was ex-communicated] and was buried, [alive] and in *hell* "[in this life,] he lifted up his eyes [to an exact level,] being "in torments [of conviction,] and seeth Abraham, [the gos-"pel] afar off, [very near in the same place,] and Lazarus, "[the Gentiles] in his bosom, [its dispensation.] And he "cried, and said, Father Abraham, [gospel!] have mercy "on me; and send Lazarus [the Gentiles] that he may dip "the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I "am tormented in this flame. But Abraham, [the gos-"pel] said, son, [Jews] remember, that thou in thy life-time "[and thou hast never died,] receivedst thy good things,

"and likewise Lazarus [the Gentiles,] evil things: but "now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And besides "all this, between us [the Gentiles,] and you [the Jews,] there "is a great gulph fixed; [in the room of that middle wall of "partition which is broken down,] so that they which would "pass from hence to you, cannot; neither can they pass to "us, that would come from thence. Then he, [the High Priest] "said, I pray thee therefore, Father, [gospel,] that thou "wouldst send him, [the Gentiles] to my Father's house, [the "Jews;] for I have five brethren, [the five books of Moses, "or the five foolish Virgins,] that he may testify unto them, "lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham, "[the gospel,] saith unto him, [the High Priest,] they [the "five books of Moses, or the five foolish Virgins] have Moses "and the Prophets; let them hear them. And he said, nay, "Father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the "dead, [before he dies,] they will repent. And he said unto "him, if they [the five books or Virgins] hear not Moses "and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though "one rose from the dead [before he dies."][a]

But if it be true that God is not to be mocked with impunity;—if it be true, that after the death and burial of the body, the soul must go with good angels to Abraham's bosom, or with evil angels to the place of torment;—and if it be true, that that Divine Redeemer, whose blood removed the wall of partition from between Jews and Gentiles, has given his word, that none shall ever pass that gulph which lies between Heaven and Hell;—then let those who reject or trifle with the word of God, repent or tremble.

3.
GEHENNA.

In the Old Testament we read of *the Valley of Hinnom*,[b] which is once[c] called by the Septuagint, *Gaienna*,[d] but never *Gehenna*.[e] This latter word *Gehenna*, occurs twelve times in the New Testament, in not one of which, does it denote the *Gaienna* of the Old Testament, although it is generally supposed, and perhaps, correctly, to allude to that place. It is as correctly supposed that our Saviour alluded to *the Garden of Eden*, when he said to the dying thief "to day shalt thou be with me in *Paradise*;"[f] which word,[g] is

a Luke xvi. 19—31.
b גי הנם
c Josh. xviii. 16.
d γαιεννα
e γεεννα
f Luke xxiii. 43.
g παραδεισος.

repeatedly used in the Septuagint,[a] to signify a literal earthly garden, orchard, or forest.[b] But there is often a great difference between the thing spoken of, and the thing alluded to. Our Saviour alluded to an earthly garden, which a man enjoys in this life: but he promised to take the repenting, believing, and praying robber, to a Paradise, which was to be enjoyed by his soul, after death. So when Joshua the son of Nun, spoke of the Valley of Hinnom, or *Gaienna*, he meant a spot of ground near the earthly Jerusalem, which, in process of time, became a scene of idolatry, cruelty, and pollution; and in which place worms were generally found, and a fire was kept up a long time, to consume the carcases which were thrown into it. But let it be noted that these worms died, and this fire was extinguished; and while it burned, it consumed nothing more than the body: whereas the *Gehenna*, with which sinners are threatened by the Divine Joshua, the son of God, is a flame which seizes the soul immediately after death, and both soul and body after the general judgment; and in addition to this, it is a flame which "never shall be quenched." But we proceed to cite all the passages in which it occurs.

"It is profitable for thee, that one of thy members should "perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into "*Gehenna*." "Whosoever shall say thou fool, shall be in "danger of the *Gehenna* of fire." "It is better for thee to "enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes, "to be cast into the fiery *Gehenna*." "Ye make him [your "proselyte,] two fold more the child of *Gehenna* than your-"selves." The tongue "is set on fire of *Gehenna*." "Ye "serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the "damnation of *Gehenna*?" "Fear not them which kill the "body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him "which is able to *destroy* both soul and body in *Gehenna*." "Fear him, which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast "into *Gehenna*." "It is better for thee to enter into life "maimed, than having two hands, to go into *Gehenna*, into "the fire that never shall be quenched." "It is better for "thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast "into *Gehenna*, into the fire that never shall be quenched." "It is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with "one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into the fiery *Ge-*

---

a Neh. ii. 8. Eccles. ii. 5. Cant. iv. 13.

b פרדס

"*henna*, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not "quenched."[a]

After reading the above passages of Scripture, any plain and pious person of common sense, would understand the *Gehenna* of the New Testament, to be quite a different place from the *Gaienna* of the Old Testament, although the one alludes to the other, and is illustrated by it. In *the Valley of Hinnom*, the worm dies, and the fire is quenched: but in *Gehenna*, "their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." In *Gaienna*, the body only is consumed, but in *Gehenna*, both soul and body. And here it will not do to argue, as Mr. Balfour does very elaborately, and as if he were in earnest,[b] that the soul and body mean nothing but our mortal part: for men can kill every thing that is mortal about us; but the soul here spoken of, is one which our Saviour declares they cannot kill. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are "not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is "able to destroy both soul and body in *Gehenna*."[c]

Universalists perceive that our interpretation of the above passages is very much strengthened by the use which is made in them, of such words as *fire*, *destruction*, and *damnation*; and accordingly, they spend much time upon these topics. I shall, with the help of God, attend to them, as concisely as possible.

(1.) *Fire*. Since it has pleased the all wise God, in condescension to our stupidity, to use the word fire, and the phrase *fire and brimstone*, to point out the torments of the wicked, or the means or agency by which those torments are inflicted, it becomes us to receive these and similar words and expressions, as the words of God; and not to be ashamed of them, on account of the profane wit of men, as we would wish Christ not to be ashamed of us before his Father and the holy angels. Christians will not cavil at these words, and quibble about them, as Dr. Chauncey has done. If God has plainly declared that there is an unquenchable fire, which shall burn the soul as well as the body, a christian will not contradict him, by objections drawn from the qualities of that fire, with which we are daily conversant. As well might he draw objections from that water which our bodies drink, to refute the doctrine that there is "a pure ri-"ver of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the

---

a Matt. v. 29. 30. 22. xviii. 9. xxiii. 15. Jas. iii. 6. Matt. xxiii. 33. x. 28. Luke xii. 5. Mk. ix. 43. 45. 47.

b Chapt. 1. Sect. 3.

c Matt. x. 28.

"throne of God and of the Lamb."[a] Whatsoever qualities may be found in our lower rivers, there is in Heaven, a river of water, which shall refresh the souls and the spiritualized bodies of God's people, to all eternity: and whatsoever may be the qualities of our earthly fires, or furnaces, there is *a Tophet, a lake of fire*, in hell, which shall torment the souls and bodies of the finally impenitent, to an absolute eternity.

The existence of such a fire after the day of judgment, and its existence for a long and indefinite duration, was admitted by Mr. Winchester himself; though he denied its absolute eternity. The following are his words, viz. "After "the second resurrection and the judgment, the whole globe "shall be turned into a lake of fire and brimstone, where "the wicked shall be punished for ages of ages."[b] In the natural progress of Universalism toward Atheism, it is no wonder that many of Mr. Winchester's former adherents, now deny that there is to be a general judgment, or any future punishment at all. In defending this refinement of error, they must of course say something of that fire, which Mr. Winchester thought would torment the wicked after death. They all, with one consent, quote that text in which God says, "He is like a refiner's *fire*, and like fuller's soap; "and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he "shall purify the sons of Levi; and purge them as gold and "silver, that they may offer unto the Lord, an offering in "righteousness."[c] Mr. Ballou quotes a number of passages in which fire is mentioned, and then selects one which he calls his *key text*.[d] He then says, "By my *key* I learn, that "the fire which causes the wicked to suffer, has the power "of salvation even for the sufferers. So in all the passages "recited, where fire is mentioned, it is evident the same fire "is intended." "All the passages which allude to a dispen-"sation of fire, which I have observed in this work," continues Mr. Ballou, "are direct evidences to prove the des-"truction of sin and all sinful works, the purification of sin-"ners, and their eternal reconciliation to holiness and hap-"piness."[e]

In view of such remarks, let us read a few passages of scripture; "There shall the *fire* devour thee; the sword

a Rev. xxii. 1.
b Dialogue 5th.
c Mal. iii. 2. 3. Minutes p. 103. Ballou on Atonement, p. 155.
d 1 Cor. iii. 15. compare my third Universalist argument.
e On Atonement, pp. 154. 219. 220.

"shall cut thee off; it shall eat thee up like the canker-worm." "A *fire* devoureth before them, and behind them a flame "burneth." "The same shall drink of the wine of the "wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture, into "the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented "with *fire and brimstone*, in the presence of the holy angels, "and in the presence of the Lamb."[a] Now, according to Mr. Ballou and my opponent, these texts should be considered promises instead of threats; promises that God would purify sinners through love. Is the sword an instrument of purification, or of destruction? Is the canker-worm an instrument of purification, or of corruption? This devouring fire,—this burning flame,—this tormenting fire and brimstone, are so far from being sent in love, that they are said, in the last passage quoted, to proceed from unmingled *wrath*. It is elsewhere spoken of, in language which should not be thought equivocal. "The Lord Jesus shall be re-"vealed from Heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming "*fire*, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that "obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." "A *fire* is "kindled in mine *anger*, which shall burn upon you." "A "*fire* is kindled in mine *anger*, and shall burn unto *the lowest* "*hell*." "Ye have kindled a *fire* in mine *anger*, which "shall burn *forever*." "The sinners in Zion are afraid; "fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among "us shall dwell with the *devouring fire*? Who among us "shall dwell with *everlasting burning*?" "Depart from "me, ye cursed, into *everlasting fire*." Sodom and Gomorrah "are set forth for an example, suffering the ven-"geance of *eternal fire*."[b]

But my opponent congratulates himself upon having a happy method of eluding the force of these texts, by saying that there is a difference between going to everlasting burnings, and being burned everlastingly. This quibble is as well presented by Mr. Murray as by any Universalist with whom I am acquainted. Concerning the cities of the plain, he says, "These people were set forth as an example, suffering "the vengeance of eternal fire. But they were not set forth as an example eternally suffering the vengeance of fire." "They may suffer the vengeance of eternal fire, if they suffer but

---

a Nah. iii. 15. Joel ii. 3. Rev. xiv. 10.

b 2 Thes. i. 7. 8. Jer. xv. 14. Dut. xxxii. 22. Jer. xvii. 4. Is. xxxiii. 14. Matt. xxv. 41. Jude vii.

a moment!!!"[a] While speaking in this way, it is possible that these gentlemen forgot that they are in the habit of giving the very opposite interpretation, to precisely the same form of expression, when it may be perverted to their own purpose. They are both in the habit of quoting such texts as speak of the *everlasting love* of God, and the *everlasting joy* of the saints,[b] to prove that God will love them, and they shall enjoy him, to an absolute eternity. Why did they not tell us in their unenviable ingenuity, that there is an essential difference between the fruition of *everlasting joy*, and the *everlasting fruition* of joy! Why did they they not assure us, with a detestable disingenuousness, that they might enjoy *everlasting love*, if they enjoyed it but a moment? Does it need great perspicacity to see that if God's promise of *everlasting love* and *everlasting joy* to the saints, will secure their eternal salvation; then his threat of *everlasting fire* and *everlasting burnings* to the wicked, shall ensure their eternal punishment?

But my opponent has already let you know that his quiver is not exhausted. If this fire must be absolutely eternal, he thinks himself prepared to shew that God himself is this eternal fire; and that it is therefore a happy thing to be cast into it. "For our God is a consuming fire."[c] This argument is of a piece with that which represents this fire as a purifying flame: for those who urge it, say that God consumes their sins, and saves their souls. That God does, in love purify his people in the furnace of affliction, is a glorious and consolatory truth: but the context of every passage in which God is called a *consuming fire*, will shew that he consumes men, and not sins; his enemies, and not his friends; and that he is moved to do this, by just indignation, and not by paternal affection. This is the sense of that passage to which the Apostle alluded, in the text just now quoted. "For the Lord thy God is a consuming fire, even a jealous God."[d] To shew that this jealousy is the zeal of a judge determined to punish sinners, and not that of a father who would purge away sins, Moses says soon afterward, "Understand therefore this day, that the Lord thy God is he which goeth over before thee; as a *consuming fire* he shall *destroy* them, and he shall bring them down before thy face: so shalt thou drive them out, and *destroy* them quickly, as the Lord hath said unto thee."[e]

a Murray's Universalism vindicated, pp. 54, 55.
b Jer. xxxi. 3. Is. lxi. 7. Minutes p. 141.
c Hebr. xii. 29. d Deut. iv. 24. e Deut. ix. 3.

But if this fire is God, then the *Gehenna of fire*[a] must mean the dwelling of God. It becomes necessary therefore, to adopt a scheme of interpretation, which neither of us has hitherto recognized; and make *Gehenna* to signify, neither earth nor hell, but heaven. If this be true, Mr. Ballou may well claim all my authorities, in which this *Gehenna* is found as "direct evidences" in favour of his system instead of mine. Shall I undertake to expose to you, my beloved hearers, the abominable folly and wickedness of this perversion of the sacred oracles? Instead of saying with the Apostle James, that the tongue which is full of deadly poison, "is set on fire of hell," this scheme of interpretation would represent it as *set on the God of heaven.* According to this, whosoever shall say thou fool, shall be in danger of the dwelling of God, instead of the *Gehenna of fire.* According to this system, it is better for thee to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes, to be cast into the dwelling of God. This plan would make it impossible for those whom our Saviour called serpents and vipers, to escape from going to heaven. But if such gross absurdity be far beneath the dignity of common sense, how infiinitely is it beneath the wisdom of him who spake as man never spake! That my opponent should turn his back upon his own argument, is natural enough. I am only sorry that his chagrin should make him deny that he ever used it.[b]

(2.) *Destruction.* In two of the passages where *Gehenna* occurs, it is insinuated, that in certain cases, if a man permit not a member to *perish* or *be destroyed*[c] on earth, his whole body shall be destroyed in *Gehenna.* In another passage we are told to fear him who is able *to destroy*[d] both soul and body in *Gehenna.* The same Greek verb occurs in all those passages, and is correctly rendered *perish* in one place, and *destroy* in another, because it is in different *voices.* The same verb is translated lose where our Saviour promises to "*lose* nothing," that is, *permit* nothing *to be destroyed,*[e] that the Father had given him. The same verb is rendered in the same way, and its conjugate is rendered *perdition* where our Saviour says, "none of them is *lost*, but

---

a γεεννα του πυρος

b He has accordingly as far as I can perceive, left it out of those famous Minutes of the Debate, which Mr Jennings has fathered for him.

c απολησται. Matt. v. 29. 30.

d απολεσαι. Matt. x. 28.

e απολεσω. John vi. 39.

the son of *perdition*, or *destruction*."[a] This noun is elsewhere translated *perdition*, when immediately connected with another word which is rendered *destruction*.[b]

The texts just now referred to, prove that the souls and bodies of traitors and rich unbelievers are destroyed in *Gehenna*, after death. To deny the eternity of this destruction, or to confine it to men's sins instead of their persons, will be found not only inconsistent with scripture, but with former concessions of the Universalists themselves. This word occurs in one of their favourite texts; in which it is said that God is "not willing that any should *perish*,[c] but that all should come to repentance."[d] Now suppose that this *perishing* is not eternal, but temporal. Then the text would read, that God is not willing that any should suffer a *temporal* judgment! But again; suppose that it relates to the destruction of men's sins, instead of their persons. Then the text would mean, that God is not willing that any person's sins should be *destroyed*! In this place the word *perish*, must relate to the eternal punishment of men's persons, or the passage would make perfect non-sense, and contradict the Universalists as well as the Orthodox. That it is a dreadful torment, yet to come in its greatest intensity, upon devils and men, is plainly indicated in scripture. Devils said to Jesus, "Art thou come to *destroy*[e] us?" "Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?"[f] That it is the very opposite of eternal salvation, James intimates, in saying, "There is one Lawgiver, who is able to *save* and to *destroy*."[g] Paul also, repeatedly contrasts the two. He speaks of Satan and the Pope, as working "with all deceiv-"ableness of unrighteousness, in them that *perish*;[h] because "they received not the love of the truth, that they might be "*saved*." "For we are unto God, a sweet savour of Christ, "in them that are *saved* and in them that *perish*."[i] To shew that our Saviour meant that this is an eternal *destruction*, he repeatedly contrasts it with *eternal life*. "And I give

---

a ουδεις εξ αυτων απωλετο, ει μη ο υιος της απωλειας. John xvii. 12.

b 1 Tim. vi. 9.

c απολεσθαι

d 2 Pet. iii. 9.

e απολεσαι.

f Luke iv. 34. Matt. viii. 29.

g Jas. iv. 12.

h απολλυμενοις.

i απολλυμενοις. 2 Thess. ii. 10. 2 Cor. ii. 14.

"unto them *eternal life*, and they shall never *perish*." "And "as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so "must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth on him should not *perish*, but have *eternal life*. For "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten "Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*, but "have *everlasting life*."[a] In these two last passages, as in 2 Peter iii. 9.[b] both parties are agreed that an eternal destruction is meant.

As this point is established, by the contrast which is made, between this *destruction* or *perdition*, on the one hand and *eternal life* and *salvation*, on the other, so is it confirmed by the connexion which is found between this *perdition*, and an important word of the same meaning. "But they "that will be rich, fall into temptations and a snare, and in-"to many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in des-"truction and *perdition*."[c] Now, that some do wish to be rich, is undeniable; and it is equally incontrovertible, that they fall into temptations and a snare; and that they live and die, in the indulgence of many foolish and hurtful lusts. Then this prophetic threat makes it as certain that they shall be drowned in the lake of *perdition*, as the Mosaic history makes it certain, that the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea. In the text this *perdition* is synonymous with destruction. If therefore, destruction be everlasting, so is *perdition*. But Paul says, in another place, that the rejecters of the gospel "shall be punished with *everlasting destruction*."[d] This proof of the eternity of destruction, establishes the eternity of that *perdition*, which is synonymous with it. It also shews, that when the son of *perdition* went to his own place, he went to that *Gehenna*, which is the place of eternal perdition; in which God can and will *destroy* the souls and bodies of gospel despisers, after death and the general judgment.

But Mr. Murray would tell us not to be too hasty with this conclusion; for he has another of his weighty sentences to give us, on this subject, viz. "There is an immense "difference between being punished with everlasting des-"truction, and being everlastingly punished with destruc-

---

a John x. 28. iii. 15, 16.
b See my 7th Universalist Argument.
c ολεθρον και απωλειαν 1 Tim. vi. 9.
d ολεθρον αιωνιον 2 Thes. i. 9.

"tion."[a] I quoted scripture just now, which shews that this destruction is repeatedly and expressly contrasted with *everlasting life*. Did Mr. Murray, or my opponent, or any other Universalist, ever tell us that there is an immense difference between having eternal life, and eternally having life? They all quote these authorities for the opposite purpose. While they deny that a denunciation of everlasting destruction, destroys the sinner eternally, they all declare that these promises of eternal life, will eternally save those to whom they are made. Satanic subtlety, when exposed, has sometimes the appearance of idiotic imbecility. This argument was intended as a specimen of ingenuity: but it may well serve as an example of fatuity.

(3.) *Damnation.* On a certain occasion our Saviour addressed his hearers in the following awful language. "Ye "serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the "*damnation* of *Gehenna*?"[b] It is admitted that this word signifies condemnation, or adjudication to punishment. The passage would then read, how can ye escape being *condemned*, or *adjudged* to the punishment of *Gehenna*? This is the word which is used to distinguish the day of final account; in which angels and men shall be sentenced to eternal happiness or eternal misery. "Herein is our love made perfect that we may have boldness in *the day of judgment*."[c] This boldness of God's believing people arises from a conviction that Jesus Christ, their divine and law-satisfying Surety, has borne their condemnation and punishment, and clothed them with his perfect righteousness In the day of judgment, they know that they shall be justified through God's covenant mercy. If all men universally, were to shew mercy here, and receive mercy in the day of judgment, none would be damned. But concerning that man who has shewn no mercy, the Apostle says, "he shall have *judgment* or *damnation* without mercy:" and concerning those who have an interest in Christ, who was made a curse for them, he says, "mercy rejoiceth against *judgment* or *damnation*."[d] Although in this world, this *judgment* or *damnation* is often the drunkard's song, and is often made so, by the profane taunts of Universalists and Atheists, the Holy Spirit assures

---

a Universalism Vindicated, p. 54.

b της κρισεως της γεεννης Matt. 23. 33.

c εν τη ημερα της κρισεως. 1 Jn. 4; 17.

d Jas. 2; 13. Comp. Gal. 5; 19.

us, that with regard to some, it is fearful in anticipation, even here, and that hereafter, it is followed by that fiery torment, of which Judas and the rich man have already a foretaste, and which awaits all God's adversaries. The unpardonable offender is said to have "a certain fearful looking for, of *judgment*, or *damnation*,[a] and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries."

When my opponent insists that we must not look forward so far for this condemnation, but that it takes place in this life; I admit that before man sinned, angels were condemned; and since that event, he that believeth not is condemned already. But if this condemnation be confined to this life, and reach not beyond the grave, why does the Apostle say, "it is appointed unto men, once to die, but after this the *judgment*?"[b] Our Saviour assures us, that after men are dead and buried, "all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of *damnation*."[c] Although fallen angels are already condemned or bound over to punishment, there is yet a great day of accounts before them, which shall be so far from relaxing their bonds, that the chains, by which they are reserved for that dreadful reckoning, are expressly declared to be *everlasting*. "And the Angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in *everlasting chains*, under darkness, unto the *judgment* of the great day."[d] That these everlasting chains bind over to everlasting punishment, is plain from the declaration of our Saviour, that "he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath never forgiveness, but is in "*danger of, deserving of, bound over to, eternal damnation*."[e]

The amount of the evidence, under this word *Gehenna*, is, that this is a place of punishment for the soul, after death, and for the soul and body, after the general judgment; that it is a state in which the impenitent and unbelieving are tormented in *unquenchable fire*, with *everlasting destruction*, under *eternal damnation*. May God, for Christ's sake, preserve you from a presumptuous defiance of such a fate.

---

a εκδοχη κρισεως. Hebr. x. 27.
b κρισις. Hebr. ix. 27.
c αναστασιν κρισεως. Jn. v. 28, 29.
d εις κρισιν μεγαλης ημερας. Jude 6.
e ενοχος εστιν αιωνιου κρισεως. Mk. iii. 29.

4.

TARTARUS.

The word *Tartarus* is not *literally* used once, in our common Greek Scriptures, from Genesis to Revelation. Yet both parties admit that it is *virtually* used there, as one of its participial conjugates is found, among the ἅπαξ λεγομενα (words once spoken) of the New Testament. The word is *tartarosas* from the verb *tartaroun*. This is literally rendered by the French *abimer*, and the Italian *abissare*; which last word is used for this purpose, in the Italian New Testament, circulated by the British and Foreign Bible Society. The Popish and Protestant French New Testaments, published by the same Society, have rendered it, correctly enough, by a circumlocution; although that language affords a verb exactly corresponding with the original. What they did from choice, we have done from necessity. In this we follow the Latin of the Vulgate and Beza, the German of Luther, and many other examples. Instead of manufacturing a new verb for the occasion, our Hebrew New Testament, now in use, renders it, "cast them down to *Sheol*;" and even the modern Greek, which we should suppose, was not deficient in this respect, renders it, "cast them into *Tartarus*."[a] In the Classical Greek writers, the verb and the circumlocution are used interchangeably. Concerning the same persons, Apollodorus says, in one breath, that they are "*intartarated*," and in the next, that they are "*cast into tartarus*."[b]

That the Greeks and the Romans considered this a place of punishment for the wicked after death, need not be elaborately proved. Evidences of this are found in all the books. "Virgil, in his sixth Æneid, where he probably has a particular reference to the representations made of a future state in the mysteries, as well as to those made by Homer, represents several sorts of persons, who had been guilty of very heinous crimes, as adjudged to grievous punishments in *Tartarus*. Vers. 565, et seq." Among the Greeks, the testimony of Plato deserves notice. "In the conclusion of his Phædo, he introduces Socrates, in one of his most serious and solemn discourses just before his death, talking after the manner of the Poets, of the judges after death, of *Tartarus*, Acheron, the Acherusian lake, Pyriphlegethon, and Cocy-

---

a τους εβαλεν εις τον ταρταρον.

b καταταρταρωσαντας=ριψαντας εις ταρταρον. See Parkhurst

tus: that some, after having gone through various punishments, shall be purged and absolved, and after certain periods, shall be freed from their punishments: 'But those who 'by reason of the greatness of their sins, seem to be incura-'ble, who have committed many and great sacrileges, or un-'just and unlawful murders, and other crimes of the like na-'ture, shall have a fate suitable to them, being thrown down 'into *Tartarus*, from whence they never shall escape.' The like representation is made at the latter end of Plato's tenth Republic, in the story of Erus Armenius. In his Gorgias also he supposes the wicked, and those who were incurable, to be sent to *Tartarus*, where they shall be punished with endless torments, as an example to others: and he approves of Homer, for representing wicked kings who had tyrannized over mankind, among those who shall be so punished."[c]

That the writers of the New Testament adopted many words from the Greeks, in whose language they wrote, is as easily accounted for, as it is willingly admitted: but that the doctrines connected with these words in the New Testament, either originated with the Heathen, or are entirely conformable to their views of religion and philosophy, is denied. There is a degree of similarity between Plato's account of *Tartarus*, as given above, and the Scriptural account of the same place: so there is some resemblance between the Inspired and the Platonic description of *Hades*. Both contrast it with heaven, and both represent it as a place of future punishment. The latter is done by the Philosopher in the following words, viz. "They that have sinned "more frequently and more heinously, shall fall into the "depth, and into those lower places, which are called "*Hades*." Again he says to the transgressor, "Thou shalt "suffer a suitable punishment, either whilst thou remainest "here, or when thou goest to *Hades*."[d] That the author of these declarations, differed from the Scriptures, in his views of a future retribution, is evident from the falsehood and folly which he has mixed with his assertions. The Philosophers also differ from the scriptures, in the account which they give of the origin of this doctrine. The Scriptures never once insinuate as they do, that it was borrowed from uninspired human tradition. It is true, the Universalists assert this for them: but the inspired writers uniformly de-

c Leland's Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation, vol. 2. pp. 267. 265. Finley's edition, Philadelphia.

d Leland, vol. 2. pp. 318. 319.

liver it, upon the same authority with all their other instructions: they give it as the word of God, and not of man. But when Plato tells us of the punishment of sin being required by the justice of God, he says expressly, that this is "as ancient tradition teacheth."[e] Doubtless, this tradition was as ancient as the word *Sheol*, or the language to which it belongs: but although the heathen world received it from the polluted streams of tradition, the church received it, first and last, from the pure fountain of revelation.

As the Church of Christ, whether inspired or uninspired, knows that this doctrine came from the source of truth, they have always treated it as a solemn and eternal truth. How different the treatment which it has received from the Heathen and Heretical world! Plutarch in speaking of the Epicurean philosophy, says that the generality of the heathen were ready to admit what he calls "the fabulous hope of immortality, but that they had no fear of the punishments said to be in *Hades*."[f] Thus they used the words *Hades* and *Tartarus*, to denote a state of punishment hereafter, while in reality, the doctrine of future retribution was, with them, an object of derision. That Mr. Balfour was, in some measure, aware of this, will appear from the following extract, viz. "Though punishment after death in *Tartarus* was be-"lieved by the heathen generally, yet the better informed "among them did not believe 'in *the fables of hell*,' but turn-"ed them into ridicule. Juvenal took no part in those "opinions of the vulgar; and Virgil says, 'it was the pro-"vince of philosophy alone to shake off the yoke of custom, "rivetted by education.' Is it not then strange, that a doc-"trine, which was invented by heathens, and treated with "contempt by their own wisest men, should be a fundamen-"tal article in the faith of christians?"[g]

That this doctrine was invented by the heathen, is itself a late invention: since the ancient heathen writers testify that it was not formed by invention, but received by tradition, from a still more remote, and to them, inscrutable antiquity. That their would-be wise-men rejected the doctrine, is admitted. To the names of Virgil and Juvenal among the Romans, might be added those of their poets, orators, historians, and philosophers in general, with the great Seneca and Cicero at their head. To the name of Plutarch, the

e Leland, vol. 2, p. 364.
f Leland, vol. 2, p. 391.
g Chap. 1, sect. 3.

latest of the Greek philosophers, may be added, (strange as it may seem,) the more ancient and eminent Plato and Socrates, Epictetus, Aristotle, and Pythagoras, neither of whom was a real believer in future punishment. With these, the body of the philosophical sects, of Epicureans and Peripatetics, Cynics, Cyrenaics, and Stoics, generally agreed. Mr. Balfour intimates that this rejection of future punishment was among the wise men, while the people generally held our doctrine. It is the opinion of many that on this subject, these Philosophers maintained an *esoteric* and an *exoteric* doctrine; the two opposite systems of Universalism and Orthodoxy; the one for the wise men, and the other for the vulgar; a system of policy which Mr. Balfour attributes to Dr. George Campbell. If this be true, then, according to his scale of morality, they must not only have been *wise men*, but "*the very best of men.*" They taught a doctrine publicly, which they inwardly despised, and privately ridiculed. Mr. Balfour is heartily welcome to the suffrages of all such wise men as these, whether ancient or modern. I would not exchange the testimony of one poor heaven-taught martyr, without a name; for that of a regiment of blinded philosophers, without a conscience.

Any enlightened Christian, who considers the gulph of moral degradation, into which sin had plunged these Unitarian wise-men, will not wonder that they resorted to the soothing fables of Universalism or Atheism, to relieve their fears. While they were willing to restrain the vulgar with the fear of God's punitive justice, they were obliged, like modern Universalists, to avert their own guilty faces from his indignant frown. Neither the heathen nor the heretical world can endure the doctrine of God's anger against sin. Although Cicero approves of paying some regard to an oath, he says that this should not be done "out of the fear of the anger of the Gods, for there is no such thing." He declares that "God is never angry, nor hurteth any one:" and concerning this doctrine, he positively asserts, that "it is a principle universally held by all the Philosophers." Concerning the Gods, Seneca declares, "they neither will, nor can hurt any one." As the sufferings of every day, under God's providence, contradict this empty assertion, my opponent will admit that God can and will hurt some, though it will be in this world only. For this he has pointed to the house of the foolish woman: and has assured us that in the haunts of revelry and debauchery, we will find hell with its ten-fold

horrors. Now it is a fact, no less notorious than mournful, that the children of this world, can conceive of no better heaven, than these sensual enjoyments. Notwithstanding the halo of purity, with which the corrupt and ignorant have graced the head of Plato, this universalist wise-man was himself addicted to such vices; and in his fifth Republic, he represents the enjoyment of such impure pleasures beyond the grave, as constituting the chief feature of the brave soldier's heaven. That this is the doctrine of Mahomet and his millions of followers is well known to you all. I need hardly add, that those Unitarians and Universalists, who have made overtures of confraternity, to the successors of the Arabian impostor, shew by their profession and practice, that this is the heaven which they desire. How could it be otherwise? They have rejected spiritual happiness, and nothing remains but a carnal paradise. After having despised the Trinity, could they be happy, where a Trinity presides? After having abhorred the atonement, could they dwell with those who are washed in the Saviour's blood? and could they relish the heavenly influences of that Divine Spirit, whose Deity and operations they had denied and rejected here? They have forsaken the fountain of living waters, and it is natural for them to hew out to themselves, cisterns, broken cisterns, which can hold no water. If, therefore, sensual pleasures, in which they delight, be the only hell which is threatened them, what have they to deter them from sin? Although Mr. Balfour has failed to prove that future punishment was invented by the heathen, it is a fact that this temporal hell of my opponent, is an invention of heathenish corruption and infatuation. While Plutarch represents the fear of future punishment, as a "childish fear," and represents the doctrine which we hold, as made up of "fabulous stories, and the tales of mothers and nurses," he says, "I am of opinion, if it be lawful to say so, that wicked men need neither the Gods nor men to punish them: but their own life, being wholly corrupted, and full of perturbation, is a sufficient punishment."[h]

The most prominent argument of these wise men for a future immortality in any condition, was perfectly futile and false, and accordingly, they generally doubted and rejected the doctrine of a future existence altogether. When they appeared to advocate it, it was only for a limited period, and for

h Leland, vol. 2, pp. 375, 376, 339, 373.

the benefit of the learned only; but even these *usually* joined in denying it entirely. Aristotle says that "death is the "most dreadful of all things: for that it is the end [of our "existence]: and that to him that is dead, there seems no-"thing farther to remain, whether good or evil." Cicero in his Tusculan Disputations, informs us that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was despised by the whole literary world. He tells us that it was not only contradicted by the Epicureans, "but," says he, "I know not how it is, that "every learned man treats it with contempt."[i] The sentence quoted some time ago from Plutarch, in which he speaks of the "*fabulous hope of immortality*," shews, that long after many of the *vulgar* heathen had received the Christian religion, "the better informed among them," as Mr. Balfour styles these Philosophers, continued to ridicule what these learned blind men considered the *fables of hell*, and the *fables of heaven* too. How unenviable is that pre-eminence, which consists in the gross abuse, of peculiar talents and opportunities of improvement! While the Universalists admire them for their errors, and give them the praise of being better informed than the vulgar, who believed in future rewards and punishments, the Spirit of God declares that they "be-"came vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart "was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they be-"came fools." By such men it is an honour to be condemned and derided.

While claiming these heathen wise men for the Universalists, Mr. Balfour tells us that "punishment after death in "*Tartarus* was believed by the heathen generally." If this be true, it is an astonishing fact. Concerning the people and their instructors, it may generally be said, "like priest, like people." "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." Now although these favourites of Mr. Balfour and the Universalits, often spoke one thing and thought another;—although it is a notorious fact, that they openly advocated downright lying; it is far from being certain that the body of the people materially differed from them. Concerning future punishments, Plutarch says, "there are not many that fear these things." The celebrated disciple of Socrates repeatedly and variously declares, that this doctrine of future punishment, "met with little credit among men." According to him, the vulgar among the Heathen, were a sort of Atheistical Mate-

---

i Lal. 2: 284. 285.

fialists, like my opponent. Plato says that "most men "seemed to think that the soul was immediately dissolved "at death, and that it vanished and was dissipated, like the "wind or smoke, or became nothing at all: and that it needed "ed no small persuasion and faith to believe that the soul "exists, and has some power and intelligence after the man "is dead."j

The inconsistencies and contradictions found in the writings of these ancient philosophers, are scarcely more palpable than those which are found in their modern brethren. *Mr. Balfour* and my opponent, at one moment, boast that these wise men reject our fables of hell; and at the next moment, accuse us of borrowing our doctrine of eternal punishment in *Tartarus*, from the false philosophy of the heathen. Their accusations are as groundless as their boasting is shameful. The New Testament uses their words for *devil* and *hell*; and it also uses their words for *God* and *Heaven:* but while Paul declares to them the true nature of that *God* whom they ignorantly worshipped, Peter teaches them the true character of that *Tartarus*, which they blindly derided. The Universalists reject the doctrine of revelation, and boast that these false philosophers did the same! And who are these *better informed* among the heathen, with whom it is such an honour to agree? They were the blind and deaf, always speculating about colours and sounds. They were always talking about divine truth, and yet "changed the truth of God into a lie." According to their own account, a portion of the truth had been conveyed to them, howsoever imperfectly, by tradition: but "they did not like to retain God in their knowledge;" they despised alike, the fears of hell, and the hopes of heaven, and even denied the spirituality and immortality of their own souls. "For this cause God gave them up to vile affections," and "gave them over to a reprobate mind," and to a reprobate life. Indulging without restraint, in the most brutal appetites, they seemed indeed, as if they had no soul to distinguish them from the inferior creation. Let who will glory in symbolizing with such men, the Christian glories in nothing but the cross of Christ, by whom he is crucified to the world, and the world to him.

The heathen generally believed in the transmigration of souls, and in certain periodical conflagrations or annihilations of souls, succeeding each other without end. From

j Lel. 2; 391. 382, 383.

these the Jews have received a sort of Universalism; and by these, Origen was corrupted. Besides him, my opponent can find no other example in the ancient church. "Simon Ma-"gus, Basilides, Carpocrates, and the impure Gnostics, we "do not envy him;"[k] as they were, like their brethren of the present day, in the gall of bitterness and the bonds of iniquity. On this doctrine, Clemens Alexandrinus, the preceptor of Origen, was decidedly orthodox; and so was Cyprian, his great contemporary, whose superiority in piety and usefulness, the Christian world so much admires.

Among the many proofs of their doctrinal soundness, I have numbered the inspired declaration concerning *Tartarus*. It is in 2 Peter, ii. 4. "God spared not the angels that "sinned, but cast them down to *Tartarus*, and delivered "them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judg-"ment." The questions suggested by this text, are, 1. What does this threatening mean? 2. Against whom is it directed?

(1.) What does this threatening mean? That it is a threatening, is evident, because the subjects of it are said not to be spared, but cast down, and confined in chains of darkness, *to be punished*, as we are informed in verse 9th. That it reaches beyond this life, as far as men are concerned, appears from their being reserved unto judgment. "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment."[l] That the judgment will rivet these chains, appears from Jude's calling them, in verse 6th, "*everlasting* chains," and from his placing these prisoners, in verse 7th, with the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrha, who are "suffering the vengeance of *eternal* fire." Peter also, places them in the same company, in verse 6th, of the context. Of these persons it is said in verse 3rd, the immediately preceding context, that their "*judgment* now of a long time lingereth not, and their *damnation* slumbereth not." These words have already been examined in the original, in what was said on the subject of *Gehenna*. There they were translated *damnation* and *destruction*: and it was proved from the Scriptures, that these are an everlasting *destruction*, and an eternal *damnation*, in an unquenchable fire. As "fools make a mock at sin," so fools will laugh at its punishment: but let it be remembered that this is done only by Mr. Balfour and his heathens, not by the Christian Church: and concerning

---

k Lampe, on the Eternity of Punishments, Part 2, Sect. 10.
l Hebr. ix. 27.

these scorners, God has said, "I also, will laugh at your calamity, I will mock when your fear cometh."

(2.) Against whom is this *Tartarean* punishment threatened? It was against "the angels that sinned." In the 6th head of the first Orthodox argument, I have endeavoured to shew, that the curse has subjected sinners to a real devil, and not a mere personification. That he has angels distinct from the human race, appears from the sentence of condemnation pronounced upon unbelieving men at the day of judgment. "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the *devil* and *his angels*." These angels, mentioned by Peter, my opponent and the improved version, would have to be men: but this cannot be: for Peter, in the context, says that angels "are greater in power and might." They cannot be non entities; for such have neither power nor might. But two things are manifest, from what our Saviour and his inspired Apostle say concerning these angels. One is, that it was on account of sin, that they were cast into *Tartarus*, or this *everlasting fire*. The other is, that the same punishment awaits all impenitent sinners of the human race. In the 9th verse, Peter says, "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the *unjust* unto the day of judgment, to be punished." In the 1st, 2d, and 3d verses, he speaks of the preachers and deluded professors of "damnable heresies," as participating in the *judgment* and *damnation* of these angels. In the three following verses, he presents the case of these *intartarated* angels, the case of the antediluvian world, and that of the cities of the plain, as so many examples to warn all sinners against the same condemnation and punishment; letting us know, that "if God spared not" these, he will punish all the "unjust" of our race.

When our Saviour commands the wicked to depart into "everlasting fire," or as he afterward explains it, into "everlasting punishment," his omitting to use the word now in question, may appear to weaken our argument. But when we observe on the one hand that Christ casts wicked men, and the devil, and his angels, all together, into the same fiery and eternal punishment;—and when we observe, on the other hand, that an unsparing God casts these angels down to *Tartarus*;—cannot a moderate reasoner see that the devil and wicked men must be in *Tartarus* too?—*Tartarus*, then, is that everlasting fire which is "prepared for the devil and his angels:"—and *Tartarus* is that place of everlasting

punishment, into which the wicked "shall go away" after the general judgment.

Thus have I endeavoured to shew the scriptural doctrine of *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Gehenna*, and *Tartarus*. I have essayed to prove, what has been proved a thousand times before, that these terms are used by the inspired writers, to denote a state of eternal punishment; and that all those passages in which wicked men or angels are said to be cast into *hell*, are infallible proofs that their punishment is absolutely eternal. In doing this, with a conscience enlightened by the word and Spirit of Christ, and with a heart full of love to your souls, my skirts are clear of your blood. Without attempting to excite unprofitable fears, I have endeavoured, through grace faithfully to warn you, of the wrath which awaits the impenitent and unbelieving. May God enable you to flee to the only Refuge for lost sinners.

II.

THE DURATION OF PUNISHMENT.

The first branch of *affirmative* evidence, which we have just now finished, discusses certain conspicuous words of Holy Writ, which denote *the state of the damned*; and it was shewn that this was an eternal *state*. The second branch of *affirmative* evidence, on which we are now entering, contemplates such words as *perpetual* and *eternal*, *never* and *forever*, which mark the *duration* of this punishment, in a still more pointed manner. Concerning Edom, God said, "Thou "shalt be cut off *forever*." "They shall call them the border "of wickedness, and the people against whom the Lord hath "indignation *forever*." "And when he looked on Amalek, "he took up his parable, and said, Amalek was the first of "the nations, but his latter end shall be, that he perish *for-* "*ever*." "And he also [the scourge of the Jews] shall perish "*forever*." "If thou forsake him, he will cast thee off *for-* "*ever*." "But the Lord is with me, as a mighty terrible one: "therefore my persecutors shall stumble and they shall not "prevail: they shall be greatly ashamed; for they shall not "prosper: their *everlasting* confusion shall *never* be forgot- "ten." "The Lord hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob, "surely I will *never* forget any of their works." "And I "will bring an *everlasting* reproach upon you, and a *perpe-* "*tual* shame, which shall not be forgotten." "When all the "workers of iniquity do flourish; it is that they shall be de- "stroyed *forever*." "He put them to a *perpetual* reproach." "Let them be confounded and troubled *forever*; yea, let

"them be put to shame, and perish." "They perish *forever*, "without any regarding it." "Thou destroyest the hope of "man. Thou prevailest *forever* against him." "He shall go "to the generation of his fathers: they shall *never* see light." "Thou hast rebuked the heathen, thou hast destroyed the "wicked, thou hast put out their name *forever and ever*." After death, "he shall go to the generation of his fathers; "they shall *never* see light." "God shall likewise destroy "thee *forever*." "And many of them that sleep in the dust "of the earth shall awake, some to *everlasting* life, and some "to shame and *everlasting* contempt." "Who among us shall "dwell with *everlasting* burnings?" "The smoke thereof "shall go up *forever*." "For ye have kindled a fire in mine "anger, which shall burn *forever*." "But he that shall blas-"pheme against the Holy Ghost, hath *never* forgiveness, but "is in danger of *eternal* damnation." "These are wells "without water; clouds that are carried with a tempest; to "whom the mist of darkness is reserved *forever*." "Raging "waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wander-"ing stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness "*forever*." "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up "*forever and ever*, and they have no rest day nor night, who "worship the Beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth "the mark of his name." "And again, they said, Alleluia. "And her smoke rose up *forever and ever*." "And the Devil "that deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brim-"stone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall "be tormented, day and night, *forever and ever*:" with an "*eternal* judgment, [*condemnation*, or *punishment*.]" "Even "as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them, in like "manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going "after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering "the vengeance of *eternal* fire." "Who shall be punished "with *everlasting* destruction from the presence of the Lord, "and from the glory of his power." "Wherefore, if thy "hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off; for it is better "for thee to enter into life halt or maimed, rather than hav-"ing two hands or two feet, to be cast into *everlasting* fire." "Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, depart from "me, ye cursed, into *everlasting* fire, prepared for the devil "and his angels." "And these shall go away into *everlasting* "punishment, but the righteous into life *eternal*."[m]

---

m Obad. i. 10. Mal. i. 4. Num. xxiv. 20, 24. 1 Chr. xxviii. 9. Jer. xx. 11. Am. viii. 7. Jer. xxiii. 40. Job iv. 20. xiv. 20. Ps. xcii. 7. lxxviii. 66. lxxxiii. 17.

From all this evidence, which is given in the words of our common translation, the Universalists are in the habit of appealing to the Original Scriptures. Thither we are willing to follow them. But when they are beaten on this ground, and begin to complain of our speaking in an unknown tongue, let it be remembered, who first found fault with our translation; who first appealed to the Hebrew language; and who first prated about an *æonian* punishment.

The above authorities are found in the Old and New Testaments. Of course, they are in different languages; and, (what is not unusual,) the same word is used in our Version, to render a variety of words in the Original. The Hebrew words *Nejeh*, *Od*, and *Olam*, are all interpreted *everlasting*, *perpetual*, *always*, and *forever:* and certain Greek words and phrases, derived from *Aion*, are rendered *everlasting*, *eternal*, *forever*, and *forever and ever*. If it be a fact that the Spirit of God often uses these words and phrases to denote an absolute eternity; and if there be particular reason discovered why they should be so understood, in the above passages relating to the punishment of the wicked; then a good conscience will oblige us to believe, that the wicked are punished to an absolute eternity. For the support of this conclusion, the premises shall, with the help of God, be now established, in the critical examination of the following particulars. 1. *Nejeh*. 2. *Od*. 3. *Olam*. 4. *Aion*. 5. *Eis Aiona*. 6. *Aionios*.n

1.

NEJEH.

This word often signifies *victory:* as in Hab. i. 4. "Judgment does not go forth *to victory*." Our translators, with Junius and Tremellius, thought this the meaning of it in Is. xxv. 8. "He will swallow up death *in victory*." The Vulgate and Calasio have rendered it *forever*.o Although Bishop Pearce has, if I recollect rightly, endeavoured to reconcile this with Paul's Greek, in 1 Cor. xv. 54,p our translators were probably right, as they are generally. Be this as it may, my opponent and others of the same principles, quote

---

xlix. 19. ix. 5 lii. 5. Dan. xii. 2. Is. xxxiii. 14. xxxiv. 10. Jer. xvii. 4. Mk. iii. 29. 2 Pet ii. 17. Jude 13. Rev. xiv. 11. xix. 3. xx. 10. Heb. vi. 2. Jude 7. 2 Thess. i. 9. Matt. xviii. 8. xxv. 41. 46.

n עלם עד נצח αιων, εις αιωνα, αιωνιος.

o In sempiternum.

p εις νικος.

this passage in favour of universal, *eternal* salvation. They have granted this force to the word, in such passages as the following; "He will not *always* chide:" "Neither will I be *always* wroth."[q] Those who believe that *the miry places* of Babylon, and the *marshes thereof, shall not be healed,* will allow this word the same force, where Isaiah says that "it shall *never* be inhabited;" and Jeremiah says that "it shall be no more inhabited *forever.*" In denouncing a similar curse upon Idumea, Isaiah doubles the word, "None shall pass through it *forever and ever.*"[r] This appears to be its meaning in Ps. xlix. 9, where it is said of the rich voluptuaries of this world, that "none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him:" "that he should still live *forever.*"

The 19th verse of this Psalm is one of the authorities quoted above for eternal punishment. After this wealthy worldling dies, it is said that "he shall go to the generation of his fathers; they shall *never* see light." If the generation of his fathers felt toward him, as the rich sensualist in the gospel felt toward his five brethren, they did not wish him to come into their place of torment. As it was declared that they never should enjoy the light of life, the pains of the second death would be aggravated by the company of a guilty descendant, to whose ruin they were accessary.

In another passage adduced, it is said concerning impious oppressors, "The Lord hath sworn by the excellency of Jacob, surely I will *never* forget any of their works." When God says of the penitent, "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more," every Universalist sees that this is a promise of eternal forgiveness. When he says, "The needy shall not *always* be forgotten," every one understands this to be a promise of *eternal* salvation. But if a promise that God's pious poor shall not always be forgotten, secures their eternal happiness, is it difficult to see that eternal misery awaits those sinners, concerning whom the excellency of Jacob swears by himself, "Surely I will *never* forget any of their works?"[s] The duration of the blessing in the one case, and of the curse in the other, is marked by the same word.[s]

In a third authority advanced, the Psalmist threatens the

---

q Ps. ciii. 9. Is. lvii. 16. The references are always to the English Bible.

r לנצח נצחים. Is. xxxiv. 10. xiii. 20. Jer. l. 39. Comp. Ez. xlvii. 11.

s Amos viii. 7. Ps. ix. 18. Comp. Heb. viii. 12. Gen. xxvii. 45.

deceitful, lying, mischievous tongue, "God shall likewise destroy thee *for ever*."[t] If, as the apostle James tells us, this tongue "is set on fire of *hell*," then it must be destroyed for ever: for hell is a place of everlasting destruction, as was shewn under the word *Gehenna*. A few evidences, that the same doctrine of the destruction of the wicked, is contained in the Old Testament, which was there asserted from the New, will close this article.

Universalists and other pretenders to religion, are prone to indulge delusive hopes of escaping this destruction: but God says, "the hypocrite's hope shall *perish*, or *be destroyed*."[u] They expect always to fly to their refuges of lies; but the time is coming when, as God says, "flight shall *perish* from them."[v] They would vainly persuade themselves that they have no other *destruction* to fear, but that which precedes death;[w] and that, after death, their hopes shall be fulfilled. But Solomon says, "When a wicked man dieth, his expectations shall *perish*, or *be destroyed:* and the hope of unjust men *perisheth*, or *is destroyed*."[x] It was not said of Amalek that he should sustain a temporal destruction in the prime of life; but "his *latter end* shall be, that he *perish* forever."[z] This destruction is never said in scripture to be sent in love for the sanctification of the subject; but "by the blast of God they *perish*, or *are destroyed*, and by the breath of his nostrils are they consumed." "The wicked shall *perish*, or *be destroyed*, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." "As smoke is driven away, so drive them away: as wax melteth before the fire, so let the wicked *perish*, or *be destroyed*, at the presence of God."[a] Concerning the worshippers of the Pope, that irreconcileable enemy of Christ and his word, Daniel says, "I beheld, even till the Beast was slain, and his body *destroyed*, and given to the burning flame."[b]

The above passages do not expressly declare that this destruction is in *Sheol* or *Gehenna*, or the bottomless pit; but other Scriptures do. It will be recollected that under the

---

t Ps. lii. 5.
u Job viii. 13.
v Job xi. 20. Marginal reading. Calasio; "Refugium peribit ab eis."
w See Job xxviii. 22.
x Job xi. 7.
z Num. xxiv 20.
a Job iv. 9. Ps. xxxvii. 20. lxviii. 2.
b Dan. vii. 11.

first branch of this argument, the *destruction*, which, in the New Testament, is called *Apoleia*, (from which the name of *Appollyon* is derived,) was shewn to take place in *Gehenna*, which was a place of punishment by fire after death. The destruction mentioned above, is by a burning flame, after the subject of it is slain. The Hebrew for *destroy*, in the above texts, is *abad*,[c] and for *destruction*, *Abadun*. Calasio very justly observes that in Job xxvi. 6, this *Abadun* is used "for the thing destroyed, *pro re perdita*." "*Sheol* is naked before him, and *Abadun* hath no covering." Who this *Abadun*, *this son* of destruction is, the Apostle John tells us. After describing a destructive army, he says, "And they had a "King over them, which is the angel of the bottomless pit, "whose name in the Hebrew tongue, is *Abaddon*, but in the "Greek tongue, hath his name *Apollyon*." That this destruction is in hell, with fallen angels, appears farther from the case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. When "they *perished* or *were destroyed* from among the congregation," it was by going down "into *Sheol*," or "into *Hades*;" as the Septuagint has it.[d] This was done by the just judgment of an angry God: for Solomon says, "*Sheol* and *Abadun*, [or (70) *Haides* and *Apoleia*] are before the Lord." When sinners repent and believe in the Saviour, God's law and justice are *satisfied* through his atonement. Their light afflictions would then be temporal. But if they do not repent, their sufferings must be eternal; for God has said that "*Sheol* and *Abadun* are never satisfied."[e] The road which leads to destruction is said in Scripture, to be a broad way.[f] The Psalmist uses the word *way*, as a figure for the ungodly multitudes who walk in this way of perdition. In this sense, he says, "the way of the ungodly shall *perish* or *be destroyed*."[g] In the use of the word *nejeh*, which is now under discussion, Job says, "They *perish forever*, without any regarding it."[h]

2.

OD.

Concerning the God of Israel, David says to Solomon, "If thou forsake him, he will cast thee off *forever*." The same word occurs in the declaration that Amalek and other enemies of the church "shall perish *forever*." The Psalmist

---

c This holds in all except the last, Dan. vii. 11, which Daniel wrote in Chaldee; and where the word is *eubed*, only a dialectical variation.

d Num. xvi. 33.

e Prov. xxvii. 20. f Matt. vii. 13. g Ps. i. h Job iv. 20.

says, "When the wicked spring as the grass, and when all "the workers of iniquity do flourish; it is that they shall be "destroyed *forever*." "Let them be confounded and troubled "*forever*; yea let them be put to shame and perish."[i]

It is freely admitted that this word does not always connote *eternal* duration: but that it is used familiarly for this purpose, is evident from its frequent connexion with the existence, glory, and perfections of God; and with the happiness of the saints: and that it has this signification, in the passages just now quoted, appears from its connexion with that *destruction*, which is absolutely eternal.

Concerning God, it is said, "His righteousness endureth *forever*." "His praise endureth *forever*." "Thus saith the High and Lofty One, that inhabiteth *eternity*." Towards his people, it is said, that "He retaineth not his anger *forever*." Therefore they shall love and enjoy him for ever. This is proved by the following and similar texts: "The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring *forever*." Concerning the heavenly Canaan, it is said, "The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein *for ever*." "Your heart shall live *for ever*." "Thou hast made him most blessed *for ever*." "So will I sing praise unto thy name *for ever*." "His seed also will I make to endure *for ever*." "His righteousness endureth *for ever*." "The lip of truth shall be established *for ever*." "Trust ye in the Lord *for ever*."

The most of those passages in which *Od* is connected with *Olam*, I shall postpone to the next head, in which *Olam* may be particularly considered. Only one of them claims attention at this time. It is that in which God says to Israel, "Ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded *world without end*." The original is, "*od oulami od*." As *od* sometimes signifies an indefinite, and sometimes an infinite futurity, I would render this passage literally, as follows: "Ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded *to the eternities of futurity*, or, *to the eternities of infinite duration*."

Concerning this phrase, my opponent speaks in the following manner, viz. "I now again repeat, that if my opponent "can shew, that the expression, *od oulami od*, which I am "willing to admit may signify an absolute eternity, is any "where in the sacred volume, used in connexion with punish-"ment, misery or death, then he has the argument; and if "not, it is evident, that what I said yesterday, still stands

i 1 Chr. xxviii. 9. Num. xxiv. 20, 24. Ps. xxii. 7, lxxxiii. 17. In the 2nd and 3rd of these texts, the plural עדי is used.

"sure, and we may fairly conclude that he cannot do it."[j] This declaration is here introduced, because it contains a concession, that the phrase in question signifies *an absolute eternity*: otherwise, how could I gain the argument by shewing it in connexion with punishment? Now if these words together, signify *an absolute eternity*, at least one of them alone, must have this meaning, independently of its relation to the other. *An absolute eternity* cannot be formed, by any possible addition or multiplication of limited periods. If *oulam* mean *a limited time*, and if *od* mean nothing more than this, then, *oulami od* would mean, *the times of limitation*. But this would contradict my opponent, who says that this expression signifies *an absolute eternity*. Himself, therefore, being judge, one of them must have this signification. Which will he choose? He has told us. After pretending to weigh his translation and mine, he says, "In neither way does it imply that עולם *oulam*, of itself, means *an absolute eternity*."[k] He teaches us that *oulami* signifies *limited ages*. Unless therefore *od* signifies *eternity*, this expression will signify nothing more than *ages of limitation*. To make out his point, my opponent must hold that *od* is *eternity*. He would then translate the passage, "Ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded *to the ages of eternity*." But if this be true, where are those, concerning whom the Psalmist says, "Let them be confounded and troubled to OD, *to eternity*?" All those authorities which are quoted in the commencement of this article, will, according to this interpretation, consign unbelievers to *an absolute eternity* of suffering.

3.

OLAM.

This word occurs in the singular and the plural numbers, and in different forms. In the singular, it is *olam*, *oulam*, and *eoulam*. In the plural, it is *oulamim*; unless when in government, as in the example given in the last article: in which case it is *oulami*. Why it should signify *eternity*, when used in any form, or in either number, I may not be able to tell. It should suffice, for me to prove the fact. Many authorities have been given, in which this word is connected with the punishment of the wicked. If, therefore, it can be shewn that this word signifies an *eternal* duration, the wicked must be punished for ever.

j Minutes p. 163. k Minutes p. 175.

As the instance cited under the last head, presents this word in the plural number, I shall mention other examples in which it is found in the plural, unconnected with *od*. If we examine the whole of the 61st Psalm, we shall find that David points to an eternal residence with God, (comp. verse 7,) when he says, in verse 4, "I will abide in thy tabernacle OULAMIM, *for ever*." In an address to Jehovah, the same writer says, "Thy kingdom is a kingdom of KAL OLAMIM, *all eternities*."[l] Did, or did not the Psalmist mean, that the kingdom of Jehovah was *absolutely eternal?* It has already been noticed that Dan. ix. 24, is urged by my opponent and other Universalists, in favour of their system. It is there said, that the Messiah shall "make an end of sins," and "bring in *everlasting* righteousness." This, they think, establishes the doctrine, that sin is temporal, but righteousness *absolutely eternal*. But let it be remembered that the word for *everlasting* in this text, is *olamim*. Does this mean less than eternal?

In Isa. xlv. 17, where this word governs *od*, it is found in the former part of the verse, without that connexion. On this my opponent speaks as follows, viz. "The passage re-
"ferred to reads thus; 'But Israel shall be saved in the
"Lord, with an (oulamim) *everlasting* salvation.' In this
"former part of the verse, there is no difference between me
"and my opponent, we are perfectly agreed with respect to
"their *everlasting salvation;* it is in the latter clause only,
"that there is any collision between us. 'Ye shall not be
"ashamed nor confounded (od oulami od) *world without*
"*end*,'"[m] It will be recollected that these are the words of my Universalist opponent, stating wherein we agree, and wherein we disagree, concerning the same text. Our disagreement is on the meaning of *oulami* in the latter clause of the verse. I say that it signifies an absolute eternity. He denies that this word, "of itself, means an absolute eternity."[n] This is the "collision" of which he speaks. Now, what is the subject, in which he says we are "perfectly agreed?" It is concerning this same word *oulamim*, with the same application, and in the same verse, but only in the former part of the verse. I say that it means *absolutely eternal*, and so does he; for otherwise, we could not be "*perfectly* agreed." In both cases it is predicated of the salvation of the saints. I say that

l Ps. cxlv. 13.
m Minutes, p. 162.
n Minutes, p. 175.

both cases, it has the same meaning. He thinks that there is an infinite difference in its meaning; as, in one instance, it signifies an eternal, and in the other a temporary duration!! Let him shew a reason for this difference, and it shall have its weight: but let him not expect that you will give the name of criticism, to an empty assertion, not only without evidence, but contrary to all sober rules of interpretation.

But you will ask, how it comes to pass, that he disputes the force of these words in the latter clause of this verse, within a few breaths of a concession, that they "may signify an absolute eternity;" and an admission, that the same expression, in connexion with punishment, would prove its eternity. That he has thus contradicted himself, is certain: and as I have made use of his admission of the truth, I am willing to examine his reasoning against it. It rests upon a counterfeit translation of the passage, coined for the occasion. He says that *od oulami od*, should be rendered, *to the age and farther*. By this he proves that there is duration, farther than *the age*, or beyond *oulami*, and of course, *oulami* cannot mean *eternity*. When I reminded him that there was no *and* in the original, nor even in the Septuagint; and that the insertion of this conjunction, in such a translation as his, was a perversion; he maintained its correctness, and quoted Dan. xii. 3, to prove it. "And they that be wise, shall shine as the brightness of the "firmament: and they that turn many to righteousness, as "the stars *for ever* AND *ever*; *to* OULAM *and* OD." To give a more complete refutation of my assertion, he shews that the Septuagint of this same passage in Daniel, has the conjunction *and*. It reads, "EIS TON AIONA KAI ETI, *to the age and longer*," as he would render it. He attributes the very same meaning to Isa. xlv 17, "*heos tou aionos eti*," which he renders in Latin, "*in æternum amplius*."

As this is an Universalist method of reasoning, I wish it to be well understood. I have said that there is no *and*, either in the original or the Septuagint of Isa. xlv. 17, and that the insertion of this conjunction in such a translation as his, is a perversion of the scriptures. Here we are directly at issue: and as he takes the affirmative, he produces the evidence. After hearing him speak so often of my ignorance of the languages, (a fault which I freely confess,) you perhaps tremble for my fate, when you see him open the Hebrew and Greek scriptures. You expect to hear him read, forthwith, in Isa. xlv. 17, and shew, to my confusion, that it contains a conjunction. Instead of this he turns to Dan. xii. 3. Here we find

a conjunction in the Hebrew, Greek and English. Wherefore, my opponent triumphantly concludes that he has a right to insert this word in Isa. xlv. 17, where it is not found. But lest this reasoning should not appear conclusive, even to his own followers, he reads the Septuagint of Isaiah, in the very text itself. This is coming nearer home; and you expect an English translation with the word *and* in it. Instead of this he gives it to you in Latin; "in æternum amplius." I suppose he thought that those Universalists who, like myself, were ignorant of the languages, would think this translation *amply* furnished with conjunctions.

When my opponent renders OD OULAMI OD, by the words, *to the age and farther*, he knows, as well as I do, that *oulami* is in the plural number, and that a literal translation, which he affects to make, would give it a plural rendering. He knows also, that if there were a conjunction between these words, the first of them would be written *oulamim* instead of *oulami*. The dropping of the last letter, shews that this word governs the one which follows it. In Western languages, government is usually marked by the word governed: in the Eastern, by a change in the word which governs. *Oulami* has in itself, the force of a genitive, the sign of which, in our language, is *of*, and not *and*. If therefore, this word mean *ages*, and if *od* mean *farther*, the literal rendering of this expression would be, *to the ages of farther!!*

The reason why the Septuagint have not marked this government in the usual way, is, not that they differed from our translators, in their understanding of the passage, but because they used the little indeclinable word *eti*, which is frequently used to translate *od*, and which, like *od*, usually signifies *indefinite* or *infinite duration;* generally future, but sometimes past. Job says, "Knowest thou not this *of old*?"[o] The Hebrew here for *of old*, is *meni od*. Symmachus renders it, AP' AIONOS. But Trommius informs us, that various Greek interpreters render it *apo tou eti*. This shews that *eti* is considered a proper translation of *od*, when it means duration past or future, limited or unlimited. But take notice that *eti*, though indeclinable, is here treated as a noun in the genitive case; APO TOU ETI, *of old*. Take this example to the Septuagint of Isa. xlv 17, and you can easily find why it did not insert a conjunction. "*Heos tou aionos eti*," is literally translated, "*to the eternity of futurity*." Except in its changing the number of the governing noun, as our translators have

o Job xx. 4.

done, and as my opponent has done, it is a perfectly literal rendering of the original, "*to the eternities of futurity.*"

I need not consume your time in quoting evidence that *eti* denotes an indefinite futurity.[p] More than this will be done, if it can be shewn that it signifies *an endless futurity* Solomon says, "The king that faithfully judgeth the poor, his "throne shall be established *for ever.*"[q] That this *for ever*, means *an endless futurity*, should be admitted by my opponent, since he believes that the thrones promised to the apostles, are to endure for ever. To all believers, God has promised "a kingdom which cannot be moved," an *incorruptible crown*, "a crown of glory that fadeth not away."[r] This eternal, heavenly reward, therefore, is that throne, which, according to the proverb just quoted, "shall be established *for ever.*" This *ever* is *od* in the Hebrew. Trommius informs us, that various Greek interpreters render the phrase, "EIS AIONA, *to eternity.*" Symmachus renders it, "EIS AIEI, *to always.*" Aquila renders it, "EIS ETI, *to endless duration*:" for what less can *eti* mean here?

In the New Testament one single verse contains this word four times, in such a connexion, that even *Semi-Universalists*, who deny the faithfulness of God in the execution of his threats; and *Cripto-Socinians*, who deny Christ's vicarious satisfaction; are forward in declaring, that it affords irrefragable evidence of the absolute eternity of the sinner's punishment, as it certainly does of the saints' happiness. At the close of time, when nothing but eternity remains, the Holy Spirit says, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust *still*: and "he that is filthy, let him be filthy *still*: and he that is righte-"ous, let him be righteous *still*: and he that is holy, let him "be holy *still.*" In these four cases, the word *still*, renders the Greek word *eti*: and as it removes all limits from the continuance of the saints' holiness, and consequent happiness; so it does from the sinner's corruption and punishment.

The meaning of *eti* being thus established, it is not at all alarming to find it connected with *oulam* by a conjunction, as in the passage cited by my opponent from the Septuagint of Daniel. The conjunction *kai* is found in the Greek, because *vau* is found in the Hebrew; and *eti* is found in the Greek, because *od* is in the Hebrew. *Oulam* and *od* are justly rendered "*eis ton aiona kai eti*," by the Seventy, and "*for*

p In iv. 35. vii. 33. xii. 35. xiv. 19. xvi. 12. Heb. x. 37. Rev. vi. 11.
q Prov. xxix. 14.
r Matt. xix. 28. Heb. xii. 28. 1 Cor. ix. 25. 1 Pet. v. 4. Luke xix. 17. Rev. i. 6.

ever and ever," by our translators. Neither is there any *real* discrepance between this passage of the Septuagint, and the original of Isa. xlv. 17. In Isaiah, *oulami* governs *od*, and therefore their literal rendering is, "*eternities of futurity*, or *eternities of endless duration*." But if the Septuagint had inserted a conjunction, and rendered it, "*eis ton aiona kai eti*," this, to a man acquainted with the language, would have conveyed the same sense, and required the same English translation. It is a rule which often holds good, that, "When "one substantive in joined to another by a copulative, the "one must be translated as governing the other." This rule is quoted from an authority which the Universalists cannot resist. It is the celebrated Dr. M'Knight. As this great critic was a renegado Presbyterian, with more learning than piety, and more zeal for his own honour, than for the Ark of God, he must of course, be a favourite with Mr. Balfour, and be classed with Dr. Campbell, among the very best of men. In the 19th section of his 4th Essay, Preliminary to his translation of the Apostolical Epistles, he has shewn that the above rule marks a feature of the Hebrew, Greek and Latin idioms. If this be correct, then, instead of inserting a conjunction, between Isaiah's two nouns which are in government, we shall be obliged to explain Daniel's conjunction, as if his two nouns were in government. His "*oulam* and *od*," or his "*eis ton aiona kai eti*," will then read, "*to the eternity of endless duration*," or which is the same thing, "*world without end*."

It is evident that Dan. xii. 3, is a parallel to Isa. xlv. 17. In this light I consider it, and in this light my opponent has quoted it. His adducing it as a parallel, has one aspect which he is far from wishing it to have. Let it be marked that he has repeatedly challenged me to shew a parallel expression connected with punishment In one of these banters, the following are his words, viz. "I challenged him to "shew me a passage where the same phrase is used with re-"ference to punishment, as is used in Isa. xlv. 17, and which "is rendered in the common version, *world without end*, and "is there connected with, and brought to prove ETERNAL "SALVATION! I again repeat this challenge! If he does, or "can shew it, he has the argument; and if not, the argument "must be mine."[s] Now why did my opponent endeavour to force into Isaiah's text, the conjunction which is found in Daniel's only? It was on this ground and this alone, that

s Minutes, p. 176.

the "*oulam* and *od*," in Daniel, was precisely equivalent to the *oulami od*, in Isaiah. If he did not mean this, then he spoke without meaning, and he should retract his reasoning, as perfectly nugatory. But I have admitted and proved, that the two expressions are equivalent, both in the Hebrew and the Greek. If therefore, either expression can be shewn in connexion with punishment, his own demands are complied with. During the dinner interval of the discussion today, a friend informed me, that even these unfair, restricted, and peurile conditions could be complied with. *Oulam* and *od*, precisely as they are found in Daniel, and of course, as substantially found in Isaiah, you will see connected with punishment, in Ps. ix. 5. "Thou hast rebuked the heathen, "thou hast destroyed the wicked, thou hast put out their "name *for ever and ever*; or, *to the eternity of endless dura-* "*tion*, or *world without end*." When my opponent thought that it would answer his purpose, he assumed the identity of this expression with that in Isaiah: but now he can discover a very important difference, in the original and even in our translation. I know not how to reply to this tergiversation, better than in the words addressed to me by an amiable and pious brother. "I was happy to observe," said he, "that "you had compelled your adversary to rest his scheme on "the difference between the Hebrew phrase rendered, *world* "*without end*, and that translated, *for ever and ever*. May "all erroneous systems be made to hang as publicly upon "*an airy nothing*."

Another subterfuge equally claims our admiration. He informs us that even if their names are blotted out forever, yet their persons may be saved, and have a "new name" given them. But if a man's old name may be blotted out, and his person saved, may not a new name be given to him, and his person lost? And remember that the text not only speaks of the eternal blasting of their name but of the eternal perdition of their persons. "Thou hast *destroyed the wicked*, thou hast put out out their name *forever and ever*."

But my opponent's most formidable embankment against this inspired artillery, is a denial that this text relates to futurity at all. His words are as follows, viz. "David "was speaking of an event that was then past, and which "has no reference to a future state of existence."[t] The only excuse for this wresting of the word of God, is, that all the

---

t Minutes p. 339.

verbs in the text, are in the past tense. But as most of the prophecies are written in the same way, this mode of interpretation would make an entire revolution in all our views, Universalist as well as Orthodox. Let us take a single Universalist text, and try it by this rule. "And every creature "which is in Heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, "and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, *heard* I "saying, blessing, and honour, and glory and power, be un- "to him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for "ever and ever."[u] The verb in this prophecy is in the past tense. Has it therefore no reference to futurity? My opponent has quoted it as referring to eternal futurity. It *was* future to the writer; though, as the context will shew, it has already been fulfilled.

But if David's words be thus interpreted, in order to favour the wicked, some of his expressions of hope for his own salvation, must be explained away. Of himself, he says; "He "*asked* life of thee, and thou *gavest* it him, even length of "days, *forever and ever.*"[v] *Oulam* and *od* are used here in connexion with life; and if this be not *eternal life*, I doubt whether it can be found in the Scriptures. Yet the promise is conveyed by verbs in the past tense.

Under the preceding head, the most of those passages in which *oulam* and *od* occur together, were postponed to this article. In addition to those which have already been quoted, the following will shew that if these words do not signify absolute eternity, there is no eternity recognized in the Bible. "We will walk in the name of the Lord our God *for ever and ever.*" "I trust in the mercy of God *for ever and ever.*" "I will bless thy name *for ever and ever.*" "I will praise thy name *for ever and ever.*" "Therefore shall the people praise thee *for ever and ever.*" "For this God is our God *forever and ever.*" The works of God "stand fast *for ever and ever.*" "The Lord is King *forever and ever.*" "The Lord shall reign *forever and ever.*" Now if the faith and holiness, obedience, happiness, and glory of the saints; and if the sovereignty of Jehovah, be eternal, then *oulam* and *od* signify *eternal*: for it is evident that the duration, and the utmost duration of these things was here intended.

But it is not only in connexion with *od* that *oulam* has this signification. When standing alone, it sometimes signifies

u Rev. v. 13.
v Ps. xxi; 4.
w Isa. lxiii; 16. Ps. xciii: 2. xxv; 6.

eternity past, and sometimes eternity to come. In the former sense, Isaiah says to Jehovah, "Thy name is from *everlasting*." The Psalmist says, "Thou art from *everlasting*." "Remember O Lord! thy tender mercies and thy loving kindnesses; for they have been *ever of old*."

The same word is often used to signify eternity past, and repeated in the same sentence to mean future eternity. "From *everlasting* to *everlasting*, thou art God." "The mercy of God is from *everlasting* to *everlasting*, upon them that fear him." "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, from *everlasting* to *everlasting*." "Blessed be thou, the Lord God of Israel, our Father, from *everlasting* to *everlasting*." These expressions are frequently repeated.[x] In the first and last of these examples,[y] the Septuagint reads "*apo tou aionos kai heos tou aionos*." In the second of them the Vulgate reads, "*ab æterno et usque in æternum*." In the two last it reads "*ab æterno in æternum*," and "*ab æterno usque in æternum*." All these agree perfectly with our translation, and with the Orthodox view of the word *oulam*.

As this word occurs in most of the texts belonging to this branch of *affirmative* evidence; and as my opponent has denied that it signifies an *absolute eternity*; it is suitable to produce a goodly portion, of that abundant evidence which the Scriptures contain on this subject. *Oulam*, when standing alone, is one of the most usual words, whereby the Spirit of God conveys the doctrine of the *absolute eternity* of the saints' happiness. Of such it is said, "He that doeth these things shall *never* be moved." "He shall *never* suffer the righteous to be moved." "Surely he shall not be moved *forever*." "The righteous shall *never* be moved."[z] "And the work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance *forever*." "As for me, thou upholdest me in mine integrity, and settest me before thy face *forever*." "He shall abide before God *forever*." "Depart from evil, and do good, and dwell *for evermore*. For the Lord loveth judgment, and forsaketh not his saints; they are preserved *forever*." "The Lord shall preserve thy going out and thy coming in, from this time forth, and even *for evermore*." "The Lord is round about his people, from henceforth, even *for ever*." "For thy people Israel, didst thou make thine own people *forever*." "Let Israel hope in

x Ps. xc; 2. ciii; 17. cvi; 48. xli; 13. 1 Chron. xxix; 10. xvi; 36.
y As arranged in note x.
z Ps. xv; 5. lv; 22. cxii; 6. Prov. x; 30.

the Lord from henceforth, and *forever*."[a] "For the Lord will not cast off *for ever*." "Therefore God hath blessed thee *for ever*." "Save thy people, and bless thine inheritance: feed them also, and lift them up *forever*." "In thee O Lord! do I put my trust: let me *never* be put to confusion." "My flesh and my heart faileth: but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion *forever*." "The Lord knoweth the days of the upright, and their inheritance shall be *for ever*."[b] "My salvation shall be *for ever*, and my righteousness shall not be abolished." "I will make thee an *eternal* excellency." "The Lord commanded the blessing, even life *for evermore*." "I will glorify thy name *for evermore*." "I will praise thee *for ever*." "So we thy people and sheep of thy pasture, will give thee thanks *for ever*." "I will sing of the mercies of the Lord *for ever*." "We will bless the Lord from this time forth and *for evermore*." "Let all those that put their trust in thee rejoice: let them *ever* shout for joy, because thou defendest them." "And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs, and *everlasting* joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." "Therefore the redeemed of the Lord shall return, and come with singing unto Zion; and *everlasting* joy shall be upon their head: they shall obtain gladness and joy; and sorrow and mourning shall flee away." "*Everlasting* joy shall be unto them,"[c]

Several of these quotations will be readily recognized, as favourite Universalist texts, to prove the absolute eternity of the happiness of all those, concerning whom these passages speak. Such an interpretation is very reasonable indeed: for the same word, which, in them, communicates the eternity of the saints' happiness, does, in the 7th and 9th verses of the 24th Psalm, prove the eternity of Christ's name and kingdom, and of that heaven, into whose uplifted doors, the divine and eternal Head of the Church has entered. "Lift up your head, Oh ye gates! and be ye lifted up, ye *everlasting* doors! and the King of Glory shall come in." And now that he is in heaven, "his name shall endure *for ever*;" and his kingdom shall endure, "from henceforth, even *for ever*."[d]

---

a Ps. 37; 18. 41; 12. 61; 7. 87; 27, 28. 121; 8. 125; 2. 1 Chr. 17; 22. Ps. 131; 3.
b Lam. 3; 31. Ps. 45; 2. 28; 9. 71; 1. 73; 26. 37; 18.
c Isa. 51; 6. 60; 15. Ps. 133; 3. 86; 12. 52; 9. 79; 13. 115; 18. 89; 1. 5; 11. Isa. 35: 10. 51: 11. 61: 7.
d Ps. 72: 17. Isa. 9: 7.

Those lovers of truth, who have patience to bear a fatigueing dissertation upon an important word, will not probably be averse to my producing evidence that *oulam*, when standing alone, is used with great familiarity by the Holy Spirit, to signify the absolute eternity of the being and blessedness, perfections and purposes of the one uncreated and immortal God.

"For I lift up my hand to Heaven, and say, I live *for ever*." "And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and sware by him that liveth *forever*." "The Lord shall endure *forever*." "Thou O Lord shalt endure *forever*." "Thou O Lord! remainest *forever*."[e] "Thou Lord, art Most High, *for evermore*." "And Abraham planted a grove in Beer-sheba, and called there on the name of the Lord, the *everlasting* God." "Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the *everlasting* God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?"[f] "This is my name *forever*." "Let it even be established, that thy name may be magnified for ever." "Thy name, O Lord! endureth *for ever*." He delivered the children of Israel, "dividing the water before them, to make himself an *everlasting* name."[g] "Let thy name be magnified *for ever*." "And blessed be his glorious name *for ever*." "Blessed be the name of the Lord from this time forth and for *ever more*." "Blessed be the Lord for *ever more*."[h] "For *ever*, O Lord! thy word is settled in Heaven." "The word of our God, shall stand *for ever*." "The counsel of the Lord standeth *for ever*." "The righteousness of thy testimonies is *everlasting*." "Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old, that thou hast founded them *for ever*." "Thy word is true, from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth *for ever*."[i] "The Lord shall be unto thee an *everlasting* light:" "thine *everlasting* light." "The glory of the Lord shall endure *for ever*." "I will not contend *for ever*." "Because the Lord loved Israel *for ever*." "I have loved thee with an *everlasting* love."[j] "Underneath are the *everlasting* arms." "He ruleth by his power *for ever*." "Thy righteousness is an *everlasting* righteous-

e Deut. xxxii. 40. Dan. xii. 7. Ps. ix. 7. 102. 12. Lam. v. 19.
f Ps. xciii. 8. Gen. xxi. 33. Isa. xl. 28.
g Ex. iii. 15. 1 Chr. xvii. 24. Ps. cxxxv. 13. Isa. lxiii. 12.
h 2. Sam. vii. 26. Ps. lxxii. 19. cxiii. 2. 89. 52.
i Ps. cxix. 89. Isa. xl. 8. Ps. xxxiii. 11. 119. cxliv. 152. 160.
j. Isa. lx. 19. 20. Ps. civ. 31. Isa. lvii. 16. 1 Kgs. x. 19. Jer. xxxi. 3.

ness." "My righteousness shall be *for ever*. "Which keepeth truth *for ever*." "The truth of the Lord endureth *for ever*." "Thou shalt keep them O Lord! thou shalt preserve them from this generation *for ever*."[k] "With *everlasting* kindness, will I have mercy on thee." "O give thanks unto the Lord; for he is good; for his mercy endureth *for ever*." The eternity of God's mercy is declared in very many instances, of which twenty-six occur in one Psalm.[l] In addition to the passage lately quoted, pointing out the eternity of God's sovereignty, other Scriptures say, "The Lord sitteth King *for ever*." "The Lord shall reign *for ever*." "He is the living God, and an *everlasting* King." "His kingdom is an *everlasting* kingdom:" "Whose dominion is an *everlasting* dominion." "His dominion is an *everlasting* dominion:" "Whose kingdom is an *everlasting* kingdom."[m]

In opposition to this mass of evidence, which might still be enlarged, my opponent would urge that *oulam* is sometimes used for a limited duration. Yes; it is often used in this sense. In Exod. xxi. 6, and elsewhere it signifies the length of a man's life. "He shall serve him *forever*:" that is, until he dies. It sometimes means the duration of a dispensation; as in Ex. xxvii. 21, "It shall be a statute *for ever*." Or Ex. xl. 15, "Their anointing shall surely be an *everlasting* priesthood." It sometimes signifies the duration of the earth: as Habb. iii. 6. "The *everlasting* mountains were scattered, the *perpetual* hills did bow." Or Eccles. i. 4. "One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh, but the earth abideth *for ever*." But because this word is sometimes limited to the Jewish dispensation, to the life of man on earth, or to the duration of the earth itself, shall we limit it, when connected with God's being or dominion, his truth or justice, his love or mercy? Universalists themselves often give it an unlimited sense, when the *everlasting* joy of the saints is mentioned. For this they have good reason: but, with divine assistance, we shall shew that there is as good reason, for giving it an unlimited sense, when the *everlasting* punishment of the wicked is affirmed.

One of the strongest authorities which can be found, in proof of the *eternal happiness* of the saints, is Dan. xii. 2. But this passage uses the same word *oulam*, in the same sentence, to declare also, the *eternal misery* of the wicked.

k Deut. xxx. 27. Ps. lxvi. 7. cxix. 142. Isa. li. 8. Ps. cxlvi. 6. cxvii. 2. xii. 7.

l Isa. liv. 8. 1 Chr. xvi. 34, 41, 2 Chr. v. 13. vii. 3, 6 xx. 21. Ezra iii. 11. Ps. lxxxix. 2. 28. c. 5. cvi. 1. cvii. 1. cxviii. 4. 29. cxxxviii. 8. Jer. xxxiii. 11. Ps. cxxxvi. 1—26.

m Ps. xxix. 10. cxlvi. 10. Jer. x. 10. Dan. iv. 3, 34. vii. 14. 27.

"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall "awake, some to *everlasting* life, and some to shame and "*everlasting* contempt." This text speaks of the general resurrection. Now, is not that life which men enjoy after that event, *absolutely eternal?* If so, then the punishment of the wicked is *absolutely eternal:* for the duration of both is expressed by the same word, without any reason for giving it a different explanation. In both instances, all limited significations are excluded by the *exigency of the case.* In this place, *oulam*, cannot signify the duration of a man's mortal life; because all mortal lives have already expired;—it cannot mean the Jewish, or any other earthly dispensation; because all are then abrogated;—neither can it denote the duration of the earth's existence: for this resurrection takes place, after time, with all its divisions, shall have been buried in "the wreck of matter, and the crush of worlds." "Yet "once more, I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. "And this word, yet once more, signifieth the removing of "those things which are shaken, as of things that are made, "that those things which cannot be shaken may remain."[a]

If this text relate to the general resurrection, which even Manasseh Ben Israel, a Jewish writer, admits,[o] then my opponent sees that the argument drawn from it, in behalf of future rewards and punishments, is unanswerable. He therefore denies its application to that important event. He denies that it speaks of all mankind awaking from their long sleep, but only a part. It does not say, "all of them that sleep," but "*many* of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake" In this restricted explanation of the word *many*, he considers himself supported by the Septuagint, which gives the word *polloi*, without the article. He insists upon it, that *polloi*, without the article, never signifies the whole human race; whereas, with the article, it does necessarily signify *all men universally*. This latter position he took long ago, in his comment on Romans, vth. On the same chapter, Dr. Chauncey took the same ground. His great antagonist duly exposed him. If this criticism be true, then Paul has pronounced *all men* false teachers: for he says, "We are "not as *many*, HOI POLLOI, which corrupt the word of God." Besides this passage, Edwards refers to every one in the New Testament, in which *polus*, in the plural, is used with the article; and declares, "that in no one of them is a strict

a Heb. xii 26, 27.
o See Poole's Annotations on the place.

universality clearly intended."[p] He might have added, that classical usage coincides with that of the New Testament. Instances are accessible, in which Socrates, Plato, and Plutarch, used *hoi polloi*, to signify only the generality of their contemporaries and predecessors, with whose opinions they were acquainted [q]

But it is rather gratifying than alarming, that my opponent has at last discovered that *polloi*, even without the article, does not embrace the whole human family. While he does this, hoping to deprive me of one authority, he is not perhaps aware, that he is entirely relinquishing many of his own favourite texts. Every one knows the Universalist explanation of Heb ii. 9, 10. In the last of these verses, Christ is represented as "bringing *many* sons unto glory." Here is no article in the Greek; and of course, according to my opponent's criticism, these *many* sons whom the Saviour brings to glory, are only a part of mankind. This is plain truth. When Christ's blood is said to be "shed for *many*;" and when he is said to "give his life a ransom for *many*;" and "to bear the sins of *many*," (expressions often occurring,)[r] my opponent formerly said, that he was thus held forth as the Saviour of all universally. But now he must give up these texts, for in all of them, the *many* is without the article, and must, of course, mean only a part of mankind. The Universalists claim in support of their doctrine, the promise quoted in Rom. iv. 17. "I have made thee a father of *many* nations." But this also, they must give up, both here, and in the Septuagint of Gen. xvii. 5, in both of which places the *many* is without the article. Isaiah says, "By his knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify *many*," "and he bare the sins of *many*."[s] These passages, my opponent has quoted in favour of universal salvation. Yet that Septuagint, to which he has appealed in Dan. xii. 2, has no article in either of these places. The 10th verse of this same xiith chapter of Daniel, affords another instance, in which, *many*, without the article, cannot mean *all men*. It says, "*Many* shall be purified and made white, and tried." Now, that *all* shall not be purified, is evident from the whole Bible, and even from the latter part of this same verse; which says, "but the

---

p Edwards against Chauncey, pp. 161, 162. Matt. xxiv. 12. Acts xxvi. 24. Rom. xii. 5. xv. 22. 1 Cor. x. 17, 33. 2 Cor. ii. 17. Rev. xvii. 1.
q Leland's Advantage and Necessity, vol. 2, pp. 129, 383. 391.
r Mk. xiv. 24. x. 45. Matt. xx. 28. xxvi. 28. Heb. ix. 28.
s Isa. liii 11, 12.

"wicked shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall "understand; but the wise shall understand."

The success of my opponent in limiting the anarthrous *polloi* to a part of mankind, is calculated to remind one of the battle in which Pyrrhus beat the Romans. After viewing the shattered remains of his army, he observed that one more such victory would ruin him. It is evident, that by his criticism on one text, he has criticised himself out of nearly a dozen of his chief reliances. And what has he gained in return? Has he proved that the text in question does not relate to the resurrection? This is far from being a legitimate consequence of his premises. The word *many* may signify a part, and yet it may be said of that part, that they shall rise again. This is not unsupported theory; it is based upon inspired authority. Concerning the new-born Saviour, Simeon says, "Behold this Child is set for the fall and *rising again* of *many* in Israel." Here the word *many* is without the article, and the text limits its application. Yet in the original, it is governed by the word signifying *resurrection*.[t] Upon a comparison of Isa. viii 14, to which this alludes, with Rom. ix. 32, 33, where the Prophet is quoted and expounded, it will be found that this *rising again*, mentioned by Simeon, embraces the *regeneration* of the soul, and the *resurrection* of the body, both of which belong to that salvation which Christ came to communicate to *many*. But while he is a savour of life to some, he is a savour of death to others. While he is set for the rising again of *many*, he is set for the *fall* of *many*. And the texts just now referred to, with other scriptures, will shew, that these two *manies*, are entirely distinct from each other; quite as distinct as the sheep and the goats. The passage is, like that in Daniel, evidently elliptical. The meaning of it is plainly this; that *many* Jews would aggravate their condemnation by rejecting Christ, and *many* Jews should be saved through faith in his blood. In the original and the Septuagint of Daniel, these two classes are distributed, by words corresponding with the English *these* and *those*.[u] The meaning of the passage is, that, *many of* them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake to everlasting life, and *many* of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake to shame and everlasting contempt. Mk. x. 31, is another example of an elliptical sentence, in

---

[t] αναστασιν πολλων. Luke ii. 34.

[u] אלה ουτοι.

which *polloi* occurs once, without the article; yet is evidently intended to mark two classes, in each of which, there are *many* individuals. The literal translation is, "But *many* shall be first last: and the last first." Here one *many* is expressed, but a second *many* is evidently implied. The meaning therefore is, that *many* who are first shall be last, and *many* who are last shall be first. The conclusion of the matter is, that my opponent's criticism has cost him much, and gained him nothing. It still holds good, that Dan. xii. 2, consigns some to *everlasting* punishment, after all the limited periods of time have expired, and nothing but *absolute eternity* remains.

All those doctrinal parallels which relate to the resurrection, confirm the doctrine which is here taught. And let it be recollected that both parties agree in the propriety of resorting to such evidence. Mr. Balfour says "that whatever "difficulty there may be in explaining the peculiar phraseol-"ogy of this passage, it is an allowed rule of interpretation, "that an obscure passage ought to be explained by those "which are plain, where the same or similar subject is treat-"ed of."[v] As he and his Unitarian brethren believe the resurrection of the body, to be the great doctrine, for the establishment of which, the New Testament was written, they ought to allow that it contains clear information on this subject: and if they object to any light which may be drawn from the Old Testament, it is their own fault; especially as my opponent has appealed to that authority, on this very subject. The passage is, Isa. xxv. 8. "He will swallow up "death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears "from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he "take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken "it."[w] His argument from this passage depends upon a misinterpretation of the word *all*. That this word is generally used in a limited signification, was abundantly proved in my 9th and 10th *Universalist Arguments*. This passage contains inherent evidence that they are so used here. It says, "the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off *all* the earth." Now "*all* the earth" here, is so far from embracing all men universally, that it excludes all the *people* of God, whom the people of the *earth rebuke*, slander, and persecute. "The reproach and contempt which was daily

---

v Note A, at the close of his work.
w Minutes, p. 122.

"cast upon his faithful people by the ungodly world,"x God has promised to take away. In doing this, he will wipe away tears from off all faces; that is, from all the faces of "his *people*," to whom the next clause of the verse expressly appropriates the promise. Thus, the first *all* in the text, signifies the people of God, who endure great contempt before the resurrection, but whose rebuke is followed by eternal consolation, after the resurrection. The second *all* signifies the people of the world, who rebuke and contemn the righteous, before the resurrection, but who shall themselves, awake from the dust of the earth, to an inheritance of "shame and everlasting contempt." With reference to this passage, Paul uses the word *all*, in the same restricted sense, in 1 Cor. xv. 51, quoted by my opponent.

If while appealing to Isaiah, my opponent had examined the 19th verse of the next chapter, (xxvith,) he would have found the Spirit of Christ promising a happy resurrection, to none but the members of his mystical body; those who have a covenant interest in his death and resurrection. "Thy "dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they "arise." With this Paul agreed, when he preached unto them, Jesus and the resurrection. Also Peter and John, when they "preached, through Jesus, the resurrection from the dead." Christ himself restricts the blessings of a happy resurrection to those whom the Father had given him, and whom he emphatically distinguishes from the unbelieving world. "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, "that of all which he hath *given* me, I should lose nothing, "but should raise it up again at the last day." He confines it to those whom the Father draws by his grace. "No man "can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me, "*draw* him; and I will raise him up at the last day." Paul confines it to those who have the Spirit of God dwelling in them; and all men have not the Spirit. "But if the Spirit "of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, *dwell* in you, he "that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken "your mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Christ restricts it to those who eat and drink his flesh and blood. "Whoso *eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood*, hath "eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." Paul confines it to those who trust in God. "But we had the sen-"tence of death in ourselves, that we should not *trust* in

---

x Poole's Annotations.

"ourselves, but *in God*, which raiseth the dead." Thus does our Lord confine it to believers. "And this is the will of him "that sent me; that every one which seeth the Son, and *be-* "*lieveth* on him, may have everlasting life, and I will raise "him up at the last day." "Jesus said unto her, I am the "resurrection and the life: he that *believeth* in me, though "he were dead, yet shall he live." Paul, in the 19th verse of this xvth chapter of 1st Corinthians, quoted by my opponent, has appropriated this blessing to those who have Christian hope, and in another Epistle, to the saints who sleep in Jesus. "If in this life only we have *hope* in Christ, we are "of all men, most miserable." "For if we believe that Jesus "died and rose again, even so them also which *sleep in Jesus*, "will God bring with him." When John tells us that "the "sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell "delivered up the dead which were in them," he does not add, as my opponent would, that all were received into heaven, but "whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire." Concerning the fate of these impenitent evil-doers, our Saviour says the same thing, while he confines the blessings of a happy resurrection, to those who have, through grace, done good. "Marvel not at "this, for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the "grave, shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that "have *done good*, unto the resurrection of life, and they that "have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."[y]

From these authorities it appears plain, that the inestimable blessing of a resurrection to life, mentioned in Dan xii. 2, is not bestowed upon all men universally, but only on those who are given to Christ, and are written in the Lamb's book of life; those who die and rise in Christ, and are drawn to him by the Father, and have his Spirit dwelling in them; those who, by faith, eat and drink his body and blood; those who believe, hope, and trust in him; and those who do good and sleep in Christ. These have a resurrection to life, and shall drink of the river of the water of life. But there are others who are not given to Christ, nor drawn to him; who do not receive him nor his Spirit; who do not believe nor obey him. These are said to have a "resurrection of damnation," and to be "cast into the lake of fire." In the light of these scriptures who can be at a loss for Daniel's mean-

---

y Acts xvii. 18. iv. 2. John vi. 39, 44. Rom. viii. 11. John vi. 54. 2 Cor. i. 9. John vi. 40. xi. 24—26. 1 Cor. xv. 19. 1 Thess. iv. 14. Rev. xx. 13, 15. John v. 28, 29.

ing? "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth "shall awake, some to *everlasting* life, and some to shame "and *everlasting* contempt." And what unprejudiced person can help seeing, that, as this happiness of believers, and this misery of unbelievers, are declared to be eternal, after the resurrection, when time is at an end, they must both be *absolutely eternal*?

The Divine Head of the Church has now enabled me, as he has very many before me, to produce evidence that *oulam* often signifies *eternal*, whether alone or in conjunction with *ed*; and always has this meaning, when in connexion with the happiness of the saints, or the misery of the wicked.[a] This decides the application of many of those texts, which were read in the commencement of this 2d branch of *affirmative* evidence. "Thou shalt be cut off *for ever*." "And "they shall call them the border of wickedness, the people "against whom the Lord hath indignation *for ever*." "Their *everlasting* confusion shall not be forgotten." "And I will "bring an *everlasting* reproach upon you, and a *perpetual* "shame, which shall not be forgotten." "They perish *for* "*ever*, without any regarding it." "Thou prevailest *for ever* "against him" "He put them to a *perpetual* reproach." "Let them be confounded and troubled *for ever*; yea, let "them be put to shame and perish." "They shall *never* see "light." "Thou hast rebuked the heathen; thou hast de-"stroyed the wicked; thou hast put out their name *for ever* "*and ever*."

It was shewn, that after the "resurrection of damnation," the resurrection "to shame and *everlasting* contempt," which is the doom of unbelievers, they are to be "cast into the lake of fire." Several passages of the Old Testament declare that this fire is OULAM, *absolutely eternal:* and although, to the

---

a That *olam* signifies an absolute eternity, is confirmed by the collateral evidence of those parts of the Old Testament which were originally written, not in Hebrew, but in Chaldee, which is nearly related to it. In them it is said, "I blessed the Most "High, and I praised and honoured him that liveth *forever*." "He is the living "God, and stedfast *forever*." "Blessed be the name of God, from *everlasting* "to *everlasting*." His kingdom "shall *never* be destroyed." but, "shall stand "*forever*." "But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess "the kingdom *forever*, even *forever and ever*." Instead of the Hebrew עלם or עולמים these passages have the corresponding Chaldaic words עלמא עלמין and עלמיא. The meaning is clearly made out by the manner in which they are used. Dan. iv. 34. vi. 26. ii. 20, 44, twice. vii. 18.

careless and whole-hearted, it may, for a while, be a subject of mockery, the time is coming, when those very persons, whether professing religion, or avowedly opposing it, shall be seized with a fearful apprehension of its dreadful reality. "The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised "the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the de-"vouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with *everlasting* "burnings?" "It shall not be quenched night nor day; the "smoke thereof shall go up *for ever*." "For ye have kindled "a fire in mine anger which shall burn *for ever*." A conscientious conviction that this is the truth of God, and that it is your interest to know it, makes me willing and even anxious to declare it to you; with a hope that my labour shall not be in vain in the Lord; but that your souls may be enlightened as well as alarmed; that they may be sanctified, comforted, and saved, through the grace of God in Jesus Christ.

4.

AION.

This word, in the New Testament, has three meanings; eternity past, eternity to come, and a limited duration.

1. *A limited duration.* It signifies the revolutions of time, the dispensations of Providence, the great and important periods in the history of mankind; this world, with its wisdom and power, riches and honours, course, cares, and concerns. In this sense, it occurs thirty-one times. The particular places are now before me, but need not be read.[a] These *æons*, or *ages*, or *worlds*, had a beginning. "As he spake by "the mouth of his holy prophets, *since the world began*."[b] They also have an end. "The harvest is the end of the world."[c]

2. *Eternity past.* One would expect the New Testament writers to use it for *an absolute eternity*, as they wrote for the Greeks who attached this meaning to it;—as they generally spoke after the manner of the Septuagint;—and as Christian antiquity understood them to use the word in this sense.

---

a Matt. xii. 32. xiii. 22, 39, 40, 49. xxiv. 3. xxviii. 20. Mk. iv. 19. Luke i. 70. xvi. 8. xx. 34. Acts iii. 21. Rom. xii. 12. 1 Cor. i. 20, twice. ii. 6, twice. ii. 8. iii. 18. x. 11. 2 Cor. iv. 4. Gal. i. 4. Eph. i. 21. ii. 2. vi. 12. 1 Tim. vi. 17. 2 Tim. iv. 10. Tit. ii. 12. Heb. i. 2. ix. 26. xi. 3.

b *απ' αιωνος.* Luke i. 70. Acts iii. 21.

c *συντελεια του αιωνος.* Matt. xiii. 39, 49. xxiv. 3. xxviii. 20. Heb. ix. 26. 1 Cor. x. 11. *τα τελη των αιωνων.*

Scapula says, that *aion* is, as if it were spoken AIEN ON, *being always*. For this etymology and explication, he refers to Aristotle and Philo, both of whom declare unequivocally, that it means an absolute eternity, An examination of the Septuagint, (with which the Apostles were familiar,) in those passages where *nejeh*, *od*, and *olam* signify *eternity*, will soon shew the use which that ancient translation made of this word; and we have already given some hints, and may yet give others, of the sense in which the Christian fathers understood it. That they were right in their views, is evident from the fact, that the eternity of God's being, wisdom and purposes are communicated in the New Testament, by this word. In the use of *aion*, Paul ascribes honour and praise "unto the King *eternal*, immortal, invisible, the only wise God." Here the first word, *eternal*,[d] denotes his existence from eternity, and the second word *immortal*, his existence to eternity. Again; "Known unto God, are all his works, from the beginning *of* the world;"[e] that is, from eternity, for this is the fact. Again; "According to the *eternal* purpose "which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."[f] The meaning of our translation here, cannot easily be misunderstood. The word *aion* is translated *eternal*. Some versions are not so decided, but I believe that few of any respectability, oppose this rendering. I could almost promise at a venture, that if my opponent would open and quote those numerous versions, about which he has been so pompously boasting, they would be all in our favour. The Syriac Testament is MEN OLEMA, *from eternity*. With this agrees the French of De Sacy; "*avant tous les temps, before all times*." Beza's Latin is *æternum*. The Spanish is *eterna*, and the Italian, *eterno*; agreeing with our *eternal*. This is Doddridge's translation, and that of Archbishop Newcome: and wonderful to tell! The Socinians have copied it from him, in their celebrated Improved Version: although Macknight has herded with Wakefield, and Scarlett, and my opponent, in taking a different view of the text. It would have been well for the church, if he had never polluted a better communion.

3. *Eternity to come*. Speaking of God, Paul says, "Unto "him be glory in the church, by Christ Jesus, throughout "all ages, *world without end*." Here Macknight breaks off

---

d τῶν αἰωνων. 1 Tim. i. 17.

e ἀπ' αἰωνος. Acts xv. 18.

f προθεσιν των αἰωνων. Eph. iii. 11.

from his company, and renders this passage, "throughout all the endless successions of ages." The Improved Version still follows Newcome, and renders it, "throughout all generations, *for ever and ever*."[g] Peter says, "But grow in "grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour, Je-"sus Christ. To him be glory, both now and *forever*." So Newcome and the Improved Version. Literally, "both now and unto the day of *eternity*," as Macknight renders it. Here Scarlett and my opponent are left out of sight. To those who give up the present world for Christ, he promises, "in the *world* to come, *eternal* life."[h] With this, the Primate and the Improved Version agree. Instead of "in the world to come," Campbell says, "in the future state." Here also, Scarlett and my opponent, with their temporal *ages*, and *aonian* limitations, are quite forgotten.

In the 1st sense of *aion*, given above, it is proved to be sometimes temporal. But under the present head, it may be shewn, that these present limited *aeons* are expressly contrasted with those future *aeons*, which are unlimited. "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this *world*, neither in the world to come."[i] The word *world*, in this text, is *aion*, in the original: and if this world mean *time*, it is evident that the future must mean *eternity*. The same observation will hold, with regard to what Paul says about the exaltation of our Divine Saviour, "far above all principalities and powers, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this *world*, but also in that which is to come."[j] Not only are the disputers, wisdom, and rulers of this world, distinguished from Christ's spiritual kingdom; not only are the children of this world distinguished from the children of light; not only do the scriptures speak of "this present *world*;" and "this present evil *world*,"[k] in such a way as plainly to imply a future *aion*, and a state of uninterrupted happiness, but they expressly point out a future *aion*, or *eternity*, which is in heaven, subsequent to the general resurrection; for which we should make present provision, and which we should hope to enjoy, through grace, after the present *aion*, the present state of existence, has come to an end. "And Jesus, an-

---

g εἰς πασας τας γενεας του αιωνος των αιωνων. Eph. iii. 21.

h εν τω αιωνι τω ερχομενω, ζωην αιωνιον. Mk. x. 30. Luke xviii. 30.

i Matt. xii. 32.

j Eph. i. 21.

k 1 Cor. i. 20. ii. 6. Luke vi. 18. 2 Tim. iv. 10. Tit. ii. 12.

"swering, said unto them, the children of *this world* marry and "are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted "worthy to obtain *that world* and *the resurrection from the* "*dead*, neither marry nor are given in marriage; neither "can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; "and are the children of God, being the children of *the re-* "*surrection*." "For in *the resurrection* they neither marry "nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God "*in heaven*." Here, as in some former instances, Campbell, Newcome, and the Improved Version agree with our translation; and Scarlett and Crimson are left in a company by themselves. The same fact is observed, where we are indirectly taught to care about the *eternal world*, by being told that "the care of *this world*," is sometimes pernicious.[l]

In the above passages there is a marked distinction between the *temporal aion* and the *eternal aion*. In *this aion*, people marry, and in *that aion*, they do not. *This aion* is before the resurrection, *that aion* is after the resurrection. The people of *this aion* are sinful men on earth, but the people of *that aion*, are "children of God," "children of the resurrection," "as the angels of God in heaven." Thus, at the end of *this aion*, we are taught that God's people, (not unbelievers,) shall arise to *that aion*, an *eternity* of happiness in heaven. With respect to hypocrites and infidels, Christ says, "As, "therefore, the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so "shall it be at the end of *this aion*. The Son of man shall "send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his king-"dom, all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; "and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be "wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous "shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who "hath ears to hear, let him hear."[m] This furnace of fire may allude to Tophet, which was a furnace in the valley of Hinnom, or it may *allude* to Nebuchadnezzar's furnace in the plain of Dura; but it cannot *mean* either of these places, because they belong to this world, whereas the furnace of fire here threatened, is after "the end of this world." Moreover, the furnace of this world cannot always inflict pain, even when heated seven-fold; whereas in the furnace of fire in the eternal world, "there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." These are the words of infinite truth, and must come

---

l Luke xx. 34—36. Matt. xxii. 30. xiii. 22.
m Matt. xiii. 40—43.

to pass: therefore let no one permit himself to be deceived with vain words.

Enough has been said to shew, that in Classical, Ecclesiastical, and Inspired Greek, *Aion* means an endless duration. It does not occur in its absolute form in any of the texts adduced under the second branch of *affirmative* evidence: yet it was necessary to notice it, on account of the bold and unjustifiable assertions of the enemies of truth, and on account of its necessary connexion with the 5th section, where it is often found preceded by a preposition, and with the 6th section, which treats of an adjective derived from it.

While *aion* has been before us, unusually frequent mention has been made of my opponent's new translation of the New Testament, together with the improved version, and that of Mr. Scarlett. As Lowth, and Horsley, and Newcome, and Campbell, and Macknight, have set the world mad about new translations, so that every one must be engaged in it; this will perhaps, be as convenient an opportunity, as I shall soon have again, to give some easy directions for getting a name in this way. Although you may not know whether Greek is read from right to left, or from left to right, you will profess, of course, to translate "from the original Greek according "to Griesbach; upon the basis of the fourth London edition "of the Improved Version, with an attempt *to* further im-"provement from the translations of" others. Then sit down and copy Scarlett's translation, with a number of unmeaning (and therefore safe) transpositions and alterations of words and phrases, to make the work your own. Enclose many words and sentences here and there, in brackets, to shew, that upon a careful comparison of manuscripts you, in your judgment, think them spurious. Adorn your margin with notes from the Improved Version. Give credit for some, to shew your reading: and after altering a word or two, give others as your own, to shew your learning. Get some printer who understands Greek, to publish the work, with Griesbach in one column, and your doubly improved version in the other. Send a copy to every college in the Union, and invite all the clergy and literati of America to read this thing, and to send you their remarks, after they have paid the postage. As they will probably be weak enough to consider you, as Nabal did David, a servant broken away from his master, they will, of course, take no notice of this invitation. Then publish, that they are silent, because they do not consider the work susceptible of any farther improvement, ex-

cept from its vastly improved author. After this, you can institute a course of lectures on the Greek language, and send round invitations to all the clergy of the city, to attend and be enlightened. They will not come; but their places will be filled by others, who will think you the greatest prodigy, that the world has ever seen, since the time that the image fell from Jupiter.

5.

EIS AIONA.

This is the phrase which is usually translated *for ever*; and its reduplicate, *eis tous aionous ton aionon*, is usually rendered, *for ever and ever*. The former occurs forty times in the New Testament, and the latter, twenty-one times.[a] Of these sixty-one instances, six relate to future punishment. These are the first six texts quoted from the New Testament, at the beginning of this branch of *affirmative* evidence. The sense of these phrases in these particular texts, will depend much upon the signification in which they are generally used by the New Testament writers. This meaning can be satisfactorily ascertained, by those who examine the passages, whether they understand Greek or not. We shall therefore lay them before you, in the following order.

1. In seventeen places, it expresses the duration of the being and life, the perfections, promises, and dominion of God. "For thine is the kingdom, and the power and the glory "*for ever.*" "The Creator, who is blessed *for ever*" "Over "all God blessed *for ever.*" "To whom be glory *for ever.*" "Which is blessed *for evermore.*" "To whom be glory *for ever* "*and ever.*" "Now unto God and our Father, be glory *for* "*ever and ever.*" "Be honour and glory *for ever and ever.*" "To whom be glory *for ever and ever.*" "To him be glory "and dominion *for ever and ever.*" "For the truth's sake, "which dwelleth in us, and shall be with us *for ever.*" "He "hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mer-"cy, as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham and to his seed "*forever.*" "The word of God, which liveth and abideth "*for ever.*" "The word of the Lord endureth *for ever.*" "Amen: blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiv-"ing, and honour, and power, and might, be unto our God, "*forever and ever*, Amen." "And one of the four beasts, gave

[a] Rev. xx. 10. Jude 7. 2 Thess. i. 9. Matt. xviii. 8. Heb. i. 8. 1 Pet. v. 11. iv. 11. Rev. i. 18. iv. 9, 10. v. 13, 14. vii. 12. x. 6. xi. 15. i. 6. xxii. 5. xv. 7. xiv. 11. xix. 3. xx. 10.

"unto the seven angels, seven golden vials, full of the wrath "of God, which liveth *for ever and ever.*" "Thy throne, O "God! is *for ever and ever.*"[o]

It may be reasonably expected, that all the orthodox agree with our translation, in these passages. Indeed every heretic of sense, would, out of regard to his own character, agree with it. Accordingly, that detestable abomination, nicknamed the Improved Version, being made by sensible men, though bitter enemies to God, has coincided with our translation, in the rendering of the phrases in question, in every one of the above texts; unless the first, which it suppresses entirely, and another, (1 Pet. i. 23,) in which they have jugulated this phrase, may be considered exceptions. In the work of suppression, my opponent follows them; for this is his forte: but in all the other fifteen texts, he follows Scarlett, his old guide, in giving us, *to the age*. and *to the ages of ages*, instead of *for ever*, and *for ever and ever*. His acquaintance with the Improved Version has only made him spoil Scarlett's childish translation with some serious perversions. If they had told us, what they knew to be the fact and what Junius and Tremellius have told us, in their translation of Dan. xii. 3, that these were *absolutely eternal ages*, SEMPITERNA SECULA, it would have altered the case: but an attempt to criticise away, not only the eternity of future rewards and punishments, but the eternity of the Creator himself, is as unreasonable as it is impious.

2. Two of the above texts,[p] though using the word God, relate evidently to Christ, who is the Supreme God, and the eternal Son of God, as declared in those texts. Twenty-one others are of the same description.[q] One more is spoken of the Holy Spirit.[r]

3. It occurs nine times in relation to the saints. "But "whoso drinketh of the water I shall give him shall *never* "thirst: but the water that I shall give him, shall be in him "a well of water springing up unto everlasting life." "If "any man eat of this bread, he shall live *forever*." "Verily, "verily, I say unto you, if a man keep my sayings, he shall "*never* see death;" "*never* taste death." "I give unto

---

o Matt. vi. 13. Rom. i. 25. ix. 5. xi. 36 2 Cor. xi. 31. Gal. i. 5. Phil. iv. 20. 1 Tim. i. 17. 2 Tim. iv. 18. 1 Pet. v. 11. 2 John 2. Luke i. 55. 1 Pet. i. 23, 25. Rev. vii. 12. xv. 7. Heb. i. 8.

p Rom. ix. 5. Heb. i. 8.

q Luke i. 33. John viii. 35. xii. 34. Rom. xvi. 27. Heb. v. 6. vi. 20. vii. 17, 21, 24, 28. xiii. 8, 21. 1 Pet. iv. 11. Rev. i. 6, 18. iv. 9, 10. v. 13, 14. x. 6. xi. 15.

r John xiv. 16.

"them eternal life, and they shall *never* perish, neither shall "any pluck them out of my hand." "Whoso liveth, and be- "lieveth in me, shall *never* die." "His righteousness remain- "eth *forever*." "And the world passeth away, and the lust "thereof; but he that doeth the will of God, abideth *forever*." "And they shall reign *for ever and ever*." Here, as before, Scarlett confines the happiness of the saints to an *age*, or *ages*, and my opponent, of course, follows him, in every instance. The authors of the Improved Version would have been glad to do the same: but they had sense enough to keep from exposing themselves. They, therefore, fell in with the common translation.[s]

4. There are six instances remaining;[t] in all of which the Improved Version is right, in the translation of this phrase, and Scarlett and my opponent wrong, as before. The great improvement which they have made, by rendering ΕΙΣ ΑΙΟΝΑ, to *the age*, may be in some measure estimated, by a comparison of their translation with ours, in one of these texts. Our bible says, "The servant abideth not in the house "*for ever*; but the son abideth *ever*." This declaration that "the son abideth *ever*," "in the house," is equivalent to Ps. xxiii. 6, "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the "days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord "*for ever*;" that is, after this life has come to an end. But it is said that "the servant abideth not in the house *for ever*; that is, *to eternity*: for, would it be correct to say, that he does not abide in the house during this life? Is it not a common thing, for hypocrites to live and die in the visible church? In this text, therefore, *eis aiona* occurs twice, with an unlimited signification. Now, let us hear the doubly improved translation, which my opponent has made, for the benefit of the unlearned. "And the slave abideth not in the "house *to the age*: but the son abideth *to the age*." Among all classes of the community, it is a very common thing, to talk of sons being *of age*, and consequently leaving their father's house; and of slaves abiding in the house *to old age and death*. The unlearned, and unsophisticated reader of my opponent's Version, would exclaim, How different was the custom in former times, from that which now prevails! Now a slave abides in the house during life: but in old times, he did not continue in the house, even until he was *of age*.

s John iv. 14. vi. 51, 58. viii. 51, 52. x. 28. xi. 26. 2 Cor. ix. 9. 1 John ii. 17. Rev. xxii. 5.

t John viii. 35, twice. 1 Cor. viii. 13. John xiii. 8. Matt. xxi. 19. Mk. xi. 14.

This is about as much of an improvement, as that of a certain expounder who read *beggar's skins* for *badger's skins*, in Ex. xxvi. 14, or another who substituted *an oyster-man* for *an austere man*, in Luke xix. 21.

We have now given all the passages in which *eis aiona* and its reduplicate occur in the New Testament. In the scores of places, in which it marks the duration of the being, perfections, and sovereignty, of God, and of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, judge ye, whether it does not mean, *to an absolute eternity*. Among the few places in which it relates to other subjects, even the Improved Version cannot shew that it should be limited. What, then, are we to conclude, in relation to those six passages, in which it is connected with future punishment? "He that shall blaspheme against "the Holy Ghost, hath *never* forgiveness." "These are wells "without water: clouds they are, carried with a tempest, to "whom the mist of darkness is reserved *for ever*." "Raging "waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame: to whom "is reserved the blackness of darkness, *for ever*." "And "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up *for ever and ever:* "and they shall have no rest, day nor night, who worship "the Beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the "mark of his name." "And again, they said, Alleluia: "and her smoke rose up *for ever and ever*." "And the devil, "that deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brim-"stone, where the Beast and the false prophet are, and shall "be tormented day and night, *for ever and ever*."[n]

In all these places, the Improved Version agrees with our bible, in the translation of *eis aiona* and its reduplicate. But as these passages declare the doctrine of future punishment very plainly, it becomes necessary for them to add a few notes, in order to contradict the text. They have one to Rev. xiv. 11, "The smoke of their torment shall go up *for ever and ever*." Their note reads as follows; viz. "It would be "very unreasonable to infer the gloomy doctrine of eternal "misery from the loose and figurative language of a pro-"phetic vision, in opposition to the plainest dictates of rea-"son and justice, and to the whole tenor of divine revela-"tion. But if any is disposed to lay undue stress upon this "text, it may be sufficient to remark, that it is not here as-"serted that the torment continues, but that the smoke of it "ascends *for ever and ever*. The smoke of a pile in which

n Mk. iii. 29. 2 Pet. ii. 17, Jude 13. Rev. xiv. 11. xix. 3. xx. 10.

"a criminal has been consumed may continue to ascend long "after the wretched victim has ceased to suffer. And a me- "morial of the punishment which has been inflicted on vice "may remain long after vice itself has been utterly exter- "minated. After all, as the prophecy relates wholly to "states of things in the present world, the punishments "threatened ought, in all reason, to be understood of tempo- "ral punishments, and not of the sufferings of a future life. "So in Jude, verse 7, Sodom and Gomorrha are represented "as suffering the vengeance of eternal fire, i. e. of a tempo- "ral calamity, a fire which completely destroyed them."

Whether *eternal* means *temporal*, we hope to examine in the next section, which treats of *aionios*. But it is somewhat remarkable, that while this note says that *eternal* means *temporal*, it substantially concedes, that *for ever and ever* means *to an endless duration*. They admit that the smoke ascends *forever and ever*, that is, without end; but they deny that sinners are tormented *for ever and ever*, that is, without end. If, by this phrase, they understood a limited time, then what they have said, would amount to a denial that sinners endure a limited punishment; a thing which they never intended. It is only an endless punishment which they deny: and this endless punishment they admit would have been here declared, if the text had declared the same concerning the torment of men's persons, that it has, concerning the smoke of their torment. On this ground, therefore, they shall be met. I shall not throw away time in disputing whether the Apocalypse relates wholly to the present world; for as the Universalists and Orthodox alike, quote from it, for and against the *eternal* salvation of all men, it shall be taken for granted, that the assertion contained in the above note, is gratuitous, contradictory and absurd. Neither shall I undertake formally to defend the infallibility of revelation, in whole or in part, in opposition to the scornful reflection contained in the above note. The plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, I must now take for granted; and leave it to infidels and heretics, to prate about the "loose" language of scripture, and about the "far-fetched analogies, and inaccurate reasonings" of inspired Apostles; as this same Improved Version has done, in another note also, at the close of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

If it were possible for a conscientious man, to write such a note as that of the Improved Version, on Rev. xiv. 11, he would do it from a sincere conviction, that it was only the

smoke of torment which is to continue *for ever and ever*, after the sufferings of sinners have ceased: he would do it from a real belief that neither that passage of Revelation, nor any other passage, taught that sinners themselves were to be tormented *for ever and ever*. Yet in Rev. xx. 10, the same thing which was before declared of the smoke of torment, is said of sinners expressly. "And the devil, that deceived them, "was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the "Beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day "and night *for ever and ever*." As it will not do to answer this text, by talking of smoke without fire, or fire without fuel, the Improved Version escapes its force, by retreating to allegory, the last and never failing refuge, of imbecile corruption and blind depravity. According to them, "the "persons who are here said to be tormented *for ever and* "*ever*, are not real, but figurative, and symbolical persons, "the devil, the beast, and the false prophet. The place "therefore, the kind, and the duration of their torment, must "also be figurative." When God tells these children of delusion, that the smoke of torment shall continue for ever; they pretend that it is nothing but smoke. When God tells them, that the devil and the beast and the false prophet, and all who worship and follow them, shall be tormented for ever; these wonderful expounders say, none of these are real beings: and if they had been told expressly, that the Emperor and the Pope, and their secular and ecclesiastical subalterns, with Judas and the authors of the Improved Version, should be punished for ever; they would reply, this is a "*heart-withering doctrine*," conveyed in "loose" language, as I conceive, "in opposition to the plainest dictates of reason," and therefore, I am not "disposed to lay undue stress upon" it. God has told us of a real devil, real sinners, and a real hell: if, by the pestilential breath of a little squadron of these rebels, their whole host is to evaporate into mere shadows, and figures, and symbols; who can tell where this process of pride and folly will end? Will they not next declare, with equal truth, that there are none but imaginary saints, an imaginary heaven, and an imaginary God?

But one feels a natural curiosity, to know, what my opponent's doubly improved version makes of these authorities. He exactly follows the directions which I gave some time ago, for obtaining a name, as a linguist and a critic. He adopts Scarlett's translation of the words in question

and copies the notes of the Improved Version, as his own, without giving credit to any one for them.[v] No wonder that the University of Cambridge, when they received his book, looked in silent amazement, on such audacity. If, however, a man of Scarlett's light metal, had been alive, he would not probably have been silent. May God preserve us from the principles of Universalism, and from its deleterious effects upon the morals of its votaries.

6.

Aionios.

This word is found in the first and the five last of the New Testament authorities, quoted in the commencement of this second branch of affirmative evidence. Thus it is six times connected with future punishment. Whether it means *absolutely eternal*, in these instances, will depend in a great measure, upon the meaning in which it is used, in the remainder of the seventy-one times, in which it occurs in the New Testament. It will be found predicated of infinite duration, past as well as future.

1. It is applied four times, to things unseen, to God, his Spirit, power and glory. "The things which are seen, are "temporal: but the things which are not seen, are *eternal*." "According to the commandment of the *everlasting* God." "To whom be honour and power *everlasting*." Christ "through the *eternal* Spirit, offered himself, without spot, to God."[w] In rendering *aionios* in these texts, the Improved Version agrees with our bible, as with all others, in general, in every language. On the last text, my opponent copies a note of theirs, for which he gives them credit: but he follows Scarlett, in transcribing instead of translating.

2. It is applied five times to Christ, his covenant, kingdom, and gospel.[x]

3. It is applied three times, to eternity past.[y] "According "to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret, "since the world began."[z] "Who hath saved us" "according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us

v He only altered *eternal* into *aionian*; and put *to the ages of ages*, instead of *for ever and ever*.

w 2 Cor. iv. 18. Rom. xvi. 26. 1 Tim. vi. 16. Heb. ix. 14.

x 1 John i. 2. v. 20 Heb. xiii. 20. 2 Pet. i. 11. Rev. xiv. 6.

y Rom. xvi. 25. 2 Tim. i. 9. Tit. i. 2.

z χρονοις αιωνιοις. Rom. xvi. 25. Comp. 1 Pet. i. 12. "Which things the angels desire to look into."

"in Christ Jesus, before the world began."[a] "In hope of eter-
"nal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the
"world began."[b] The same words *Chronoi aionioi*, occuring in all these places, have received a uniform translation, in our bible. Not so with my opponent's excessively improved version. The same words, he renders *former ages*, in the first text, and *aionian times*, in the two last. This, however, was necessary, in order to make his New Translation, a faithful copy of Scarlett's old one. How easy it is, now-a-days, to translate from the original Greek!

On these two last texts, Macknight speaks as follows; viz. "Supposing the word *aionios* in this clause, to signify *eter-*
"*nal*, the literal translation of the passage would be, *before*
"*eternal times*. But that being a contradiction in terms,
"our translators, contrary to the propriety of the Greek
"language, have rendered it, *before the world began*." From such reasoning as this, the most eminent anti-universalist polemic has relinquished these two instances, and these alone, of all the seventy-one, in which this word occurs. But if these *a priori* reasonings be regarded, we may speculate away every thing that is valuable in criticism and theology. Language is arbitrary, and is formed by custom. The use of ancient languages is no more subject to the control of a modern critic, than the fires of Ætna are subject to a modern engineer. This sort of reasoning would attach absurdity to some of the best authorized usages of our own language. Is it more contradictory to say, that *before eternity* and *absolute eternity* mean the same thing, than to say that *ravel* and *unravel* mean the same? Because two negatives make an affirmative with us, shall we charge the Greeks with absurdity, for making them an emphatical negative? It is well for us, that there are some men, of all ages, and all degrees of improvement, whom such sophistry never moves. The established signification of AIONIOS, *eternal*, did not prevent Gregory Nazianzen from using PROAIONIOS, *before eternal*, in the same sense. Thus is it understood by the best modern expositors of the language. Hedericus explains PROAIONIOS, by the Latin ÆTERNUS, *eternal*; and Scapula explains the same word, by OMNI ÆTERNITATE PRIOR, *before all eternity*. This is, to all intents and purposes, as absurd, as the expression *before the eternal times*, which Macknight

---

[a] προ χρονων αιωνιων. 2 Tim. i. 9.
[b] προ χρονων αιωνιων. Tit. i. 2.
[c] P. 222.

has condemned. Yet either *before the eternal times*, or *before all eternity*, would be as correct a translation of the texts in question, as "*above all heavens*" is of Eph. iv. 10. The Scriptures recognize three heavens, the ærial and ætherial heavens, and the heavens of heavens: higher than which, no one ever went. Yet the apostle says, "He that descended, "is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, "that he might fill all things:" Now, if the heavens are to be understood literally, would not Macknight's mode of interpretation make this passage say, that Christ has not only ascended above the first heavens, our atmosphere, in which clouds are suspended, and birds fly;—not only above the second heavens, in which the sun, moon and stars are placed;—but above, and far above, all heavens, even the third heavens, the residence of God and angels, and saints? But suppose that in this text, *heavens* should be understood metonymically. Suppose that it means the inhabitants of heaven. Would not Macknight's mode of interpretation make the text say, that Christ had ascended not only above saints and angels, but far above the eternal Father, and the eternal Spirit? It is easy for a sickly hypercriticism to find absurdities in the best translation, or even in the pure, authentic, and infallible original. Yet in answer to them all, I would say, that Christ has ascended into heaven; and that to express this emphatically, the apostle said that he had ascended far above all heavens. So I would say that salvation through Christ, was promised before the world began, before the commencement of time, that is, from eternity: and this is emphatically expressed by the apostle, when speaking of this salvation, as a thing "which God, that cannot lie, promised, PRO CHRONON AIONION, *before the eternal times*; that is, from an absolute eternity.

There is not a whit more of absurdity, in this mode of expression, than there is in the addition and multiplication of *eternities*, which we find practised in the Old and New Testament, with such intelligible familiarity, and such unquestionable correctness. In most subjects, the plural is more than the singular: not so with *olam* and *aion*. In most cases, the amount is greatly enhanced by the multiplication of a plural. Myriads of myriads mentioned Rev. ix. 16, is ten thousand times more than the simple plural. Not so with eternity. The addition or multiplication of *aions* amounts to nothing more than an emphatical way of expressing a simple eternity. *Eis aiona* and its reduplicate mean the same

thing. So the word *God* and its reduplicate mean the same thing. When the Council of Nice says, "We believe in one God," did they mean any thing more, or any thing less than the true God? When the same Council say that the Lord Jesus Christ is "God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God," they speak thus, not to represent the Saviour, as more or less than God, but to express in an unequivocal manner, his essential Deity, and his peculiar and eternal relation to the Father. So we speak of *heaven* as God's dwelling place; and we mean no other than his dwelling-place, when we speak of the *heavens* and the *heavens of heavens*, or *far above all heavens*. Thus do the scriptures mean the same thing by *from eternity*, and "*before the eternal times*."

4. It is applied ten times to the future duration of Christian fraternity, of the celestial house and habitation of the saints, of their glory and inheritance, consolation, salvation, and redemption. "For perhaps he therefore departed for a "season, that thou mightest receive him *for ever*." "I say "unto you, make to yourselves friends of the Mammon of "unrighteousness, that when ye fail, they may receive you "into *everlasting* habitations." "Therefore I endure all "things for the elects' sake, that they may also obtain the "salvation which is in Christ Jesus, with *eternal* glory." "But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto his *eter-"nal* glory, by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered "awhile, make you perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle you." "Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our "Father, who hath loved us, and given us *everlasting* conso-"lation, and good hope, through grace." "The promise of "*eternal* inheritance." "Having obtained *eternal* redemp-"tion for us." "He became the author of *eternal* salvation "unto all them that obey him." "An house not made with "hands, *eternal* in the heavens." "A far more exceeding and "*eternal* weight of glory."[d]

The above passages speak of the future happiness of believers, which my opponent professes to believe *eternal*. They contrast that eternal happiness with these temporal afflictions; and they are intended to comfort the Christian under the calamities of time. No one ought, therefore, to doubt, that the word *aionios* is here used in an unlimited sense, and has been correctly rendered in our bible. But, Scarlett, knowing the consequence of such an admission, chose rather

d Philem. xv. Luke xvi. 9. 2 Tim. ii. 10. 1 Pet. v. 10. 2 Thess. ii. 16. Heb. ix. 15, 12, v. 9. 2 Cor. v. 1. iv. 17.

to transcribe than translate, and has thus spoken to the unlearned reader in an unknown tongue. A Ministerial brother in the West, once lent me a book on Universalism; in which the author, whose name I cannot recollect, supposes a case of a poor afflicted widow, endeavouring to seek in religion, an alleviation for her many and heavy sorrows. Applying to Mr. Scarlett, a professed Christian Minister, he lends her a copy of his New Testament. She opens at 2 Cor. iv. 17. "For our momentary light affliction is working out for us "a most exceeding *æonian* weight of glory." This treats of affliction, and is probably applicable to her case; but what it means, she cannot tell. She visits her learned instructor, and says, "Dear Mr. Scarlett; what does *æonian* mean?" 'Why, Madam, it means *agical*, or *age-lasting*.' "And may "I be so bold as to ask, what is the meaning of *agical*, or *age-lasting*?" '*Age-lasting*, or *agical*, Madam, has different significations. It sometimes means as long as the world lasts, 'and sometimes, as long as a dispensation, or a man's life 'lasts, whether it be a thousand years or one year.' "And "dear Mr. Scarlett, is that all the extent of glory and happiness, which Christianity offers to a poor old widow, who "is sinking under the weight of more than half a century of "sorrow?"

But, from my opponent's reply to this supposed case, he would be understood to insinuate that it was not found in a book, as stated, but that it was manufactured for the occasion, and the name of Scarlett used, where his was really intended. He therefore requests that his own name may be openly used in such cases. The truth is, there is very little more difference between the two, than there is between an original and a copy. This request may be complied with, as soon as I have given a becoming attention to his translation and exposition of the afflicted widow's text. "For our "present light affliction worketh for us an excessively ex-"ceeding *aionian* weight of glory." In a note he gives us the Greek,[o] and then speaks as follows, viz. "Now if *aionion* "be strictly infinite or endless, how can any thing exceed it, "even by a rhetorical figure, so as to be *hyperbole upon hyperbole* above or beyond it?" The sentiment of this question he has urged before you, not only interrogatively but positively. "Excessively exceeding *aionian* weight of glory," is an altered translation borrowed from one who had little

[o] καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον.

idea of the perversion which it was doomed to undergo. Its author meant *exceeding* to be in apposition with *aionian* or *eternal*, and would have been as well satisfied to have rendered it "exceedingly excessive eternal;" thus making it evident that the one adjective was in apposition with the other. This is consistent with the original, and leaves *aionian* with its true meaning, that of *absolutely eternal*. But my opponent treats *exceeding* as a participle governing *aionian*: thus representing the weight of glory as *exceeding aionian*, in such a manner as to excel it, transcend it, go "above or beyond it." If this criticism had any foundation, then might there be one place in the whole New Testament, in which *aionos* is used with a limited signification. But every person who understands the Greek language, will perceive, at a glance, that this is a mere artifice, intended to mislead those who could not examine the original for themselves.

I have reason to believe that my opponent has read a comment upon this passage, by Chrysostom, one of the Greek Fathers.[f] How differently does this early and enlightened scholar interpret the words of his own language, from one who claims the character of a translator from the original Greek! In explaining this passage of the apostle, Chrysostom says, "He opposes things present to things future, *a* "*moment to eternity*, lightness to weight, affliction to glory; "nor is he satisfied with this, but he adds another word, and "that a reduplication, saying, '*kath' hyperbolen eis hyper-*"*bolen*,' that is, an exceedingly excessive greatness."[g] Here this eloquent Greek Father does not represent *aionian*, as infinitely transcended by something else, but he considers the apostle as contrasting *aionian* with the *moment* of this life, and making it to excel it, by *an exceedingly excessive greatness*. As this cannot be truly said, of any thing but *eternity*, Chrysostom has given his decided testimony, that *aionian* means an *absolutely eternal*

That gloss of my opponent, by which he would make *exceeding* to be a participle, governing *aionian*, and thus exceedingly limiting its duration, is probably an invention of his own. No translator or commentator, ancient or modern, within the restricted circle of my acquaintance, appears ever

---

f This observation was made in the debate, not from an apprehension that my opponent was familiar with the Fathers, but because the commentary in question is quoted by Parkhurst, whose lexicons I soon found, formed the horizon of my opponent's critical researches.

g μεγεθος ὑπερβολικως ὑπερβολικων.

to have imagined such an absurdity. Even the authors of the Improved Version, who wrote for the very purpose of misleading their readers, had too much knowledge of Greek, and of the present state of society, to attempt such an imposition. Their translation is, "For our present light affliction "worketh for us a very exceeding and *everlasting* weight of "glory." Although this does not strongly present the antitheses of the original, it still offers the consolation of *eternal* happiness in heaven, to God's afflicted and poor people on earth.

In the next chapter of this Epistle, Paul preaches the same consolatory doctrine, without the use of those *hyperboles* which we have been discussing. "For we know that if our "earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have "a building of God, an house not made with hands, *eternal* "in the heavens."[h] My opponent, as usual, has this, "*aionian* in the heavens." Now I will not send the afflicted widow to Mr. Scarlett, about this translation: but as my opponent has requested that his name may be used instead of Scarlett's, I will make application to him myself. Here is a poor, weakly, sickly sinner, who, to all appearance, is not far from his latter end. Nothing but the Gospel of Christ can give me comfort. While my earthly tabernacle is near to dissolution, I read in a certain thing, professing to be a New Translation, that there is an *aionian* house above. I enquire into the meaning of this word. Can you tell me, Mr. *Scarlett*, or, as my opponent prefers my using another name, can you tell me, Mr. *Crimson*, what is meant by *aionian*, in your translation? In the 216th page of his Lectures, he answers me "that these words do not, in any instance, "necessarily convey an idea of eternity; nor yet an endless "duration of time." Yes, these are my opponent's words: and the tendency of them to deny that the saints have any revealed charter of eternal happiness is evident. And is it a fact then, that even that house which is not made with hands, is subject to dissolution? So natural is the leaning of the doctrine of universal salvation, to that of universal annihilation, or damnation, or Atheism, that it would leave us to mere conjecture, or, at best, to unassisted reason, to ascertain whether any should enjoy eternal happiness or not.

My opponent has also objected, to my understanding of the first text quoted, in the beginning of this sub-section. It

---

h 2 Cor. v. 1.

in Philemon 15. In his 8th Lecture we find the following paragraph extracted from Scarlett; viz "The word *aionian* "expresses duration or continuance; but it is sometimes of "a short, and at other times of a longer duration. Paul, writ-"ing to Philemon, concerning Onesimus, says, 'perhaps he 'was separated for a while, that thou mightest have him 'æonianly.' This certainly could mean, only during the life "of Onesimus." When Scarlett is the teacher, my opponent is a very apt scholar. Accordingly, his New Testament renders the passage, "Perhaps also for this reason he was "separated for a little while, that thou mightest have him, "*for life*." Macknight, whom he has quoted in his favour, may be well balanced by Estius, whom Macknight has cited in our favour. But we both profess to have better evidence than any man's opinion. My opponent's argument is this;—Paul intimates that Onesimus may be the slave of Philemon *aionianly*;—But in the future life there is no slavery;—therefore, *aionian* must mean *during this life*. This is plausible; and it would be unanswerable, if it were not for one thing: and that is, that the major proposition contradicts the very passage which my opponent depends upon to support it. Where does the apostle say, that Philemon may have Onesimus as a servant *for ever*? The Improved Version, which coincides with our translation; (and which, notwithstanding its deep depravity, is often better than Macknight, that cold-hearted apostate,) the Improved Version, reads as follows: "For perhaps he therefore departed for a time, that thou "mightest receive him *for ever; no longer as a servant, but* "*as above a servant, a beloved brother*." In this world it is an inestimable privilege of Christ's mystical body, that its members are spiritually united to their common head, and to each other. But there is also a promise, that "neither death nor life," "nor things present nor things to come," shall dissolve this union.[i] My argument therefore, is this;—Paul says, that Philemon may have Onesimus, as his *aionion* brother;—But Christian brotherhood is absolutely eternal;—Therefore *aionion* means *absolutely eternal*. And so it plainly does in all the ten instances quoted in this subsection.

5. In the forty-one remaining instances of its occurrence, unconnected with punishment, it is always found connected with life; and in every individual text, speaks of a state of

---

i Rom. viii. 38, 39.

endless happiness.j "What shall I do to inherit *eternal* life?"k "Search the Scriptures: for in them ye think ye have *eternal* "*life*, and they are they which testify of me." "Ye put it "from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of *everlasting* "*life*." "No murderer hath *eternal life* abiding in him." "Keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy "of our Lord Jesus Christ, unto *eternal life*." "And every "one that hath forsaken houses, or brothers, or sisters, or "father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my "sake, shall receive one hundred fold, and shall inherit *ever*-"*lasting life*."l "Whosoever believeth in him, should not "perish, but have *eternal life*:" or "*everlasting life*." "He "that believeth on the Son hath *everlasting life*." "The wa-"ter that I shall give him, shall be in him, a well of water "springing up into *everlasting life*." "He that reapeth, re-"ceiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto *life eternal*." "He "that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, "hath *everlasting life*, and shall not come into condemnation, "but is passed from death unto life." "Labour not for the "meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto "*everlasting life*." "This is the will of him that sent me, "that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, "may have *everlasting life*." "He that believeth on me, hath "*everlasting life*." "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh "my blood, hath *eternal life*." "Thou hast the words of "*eternal life*." "And I give unto them *eternal life*, and they "shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out "of my hand." "He that loveth his life, shall lose it, and he "that hateth his life in this world, shall keep it unto *life eter*-"*nal*." "And I know that his commandment is *life ever*-"*lasting*." "Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that "he should give *eternal life* to as many as thou hast given "him. And this is *life eternal*; that they might know thee, "the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."m "And as many as were ordained to *eternal life*, believed."

---

j During the debate, I gave a concise gloss upon these texts as they were read, to prove that they really meant *eternal life*. These and much other matter which was spoken, and much which was prepared, and not spoken, I omit, for precision's sake, in the written argument. Neither are all of the texts repeated in whole or in part; because many of them are almost in the same words: but all are referred to in the notes.

k Matt. xix. 16. x. 17. Luke x. 25. xviii. 18.

l John v. 39. Acts xiii. 46. 1 John iii. 15. Jude 21. Matt. xix. 29. Mk. x. 30. Luke xviii. 30

m John iii. 15, 16, 36. iv. 14, 36. v. 24. vi. 27, 40, 47, 54, 68. x. 28. xii. 25, 50. xvii. 2, 3.

"To them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, seek "for glory and honour, and immortality, *eternal life*." "That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace "reign through righteousness, unto *eternal life*, by Jesus "Christ our Lord." "Ye have your fruit unto holiness, and "the end *everlasting life*. For the wages of sin is death; but "the gift of God is *eternal life*, through Jesus Christ our "Lord." "He that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit "reap *life everlasting*." "Howbeit, for this cause I obtained "mercy; that in me first, Jesus Christ might shew forth all "long-suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereaf-"ter, believe on him, to *life everlasting*." "Fight the good "fight of faith; lay hold on *eternal life*."[n] "In hope of *eter-"nal life*." "According to the hope of *eternal life*." "And "this is the promise that he hath promised us, even *eternal "life*." "And this is the record, that God hath given to us "*eternal life*, and this life is in his Son." "These things "have I written unto you that believe on the name of the "Son of God, that ye may know that ye have *eternal life*."[o]

If that is *absolutely eternal life*, which is the result of God's unparallelled love, which is Christ's greatest gift, and the subject of the greatest promise;—if that be really *eternal life*, which Jews and murderers rejected and forfeited, and which apostles, saints and martyrs gained, through grace, in exchange for temporal life;—if that be truly *eternal life*, which we are required to seek, as an imperishable good, and an everlasting consolation, connected with a good hope;—then, *aionios* means *absolutely eternal*. Socinians themselves acknowledge that *immortality*, or *incorruption* means an absolute eternity: yet in the above passages, God has promised *eternal life* to those who seek *immortality* or *incorruption*. All but Atheists acknowledge that God exists, in the exercise of his infinite perfections, to an *absolute eternity*: yet in the above authorities, we find that while God and Christ thus exist, the *eternal life* of the saints shall endure.[p] So far is it from having bounds set to it, in the passages quoted, *eternal* glory is expressly contrasted with temporal suffering, and the *eternal* house and habitation of believers is contrasted with their earthly and failing abode.

Out of the seventy-one places in which this word occurs, we have now recounted sixty-five; in all of which, the un-

n Acts xiii. 48. Rom. ii. 7. v. 21. vi. 22, 23. Gal. vi. 8. 1 Tim. i. 16. vi. 12, 19.
o Tit. i. 2. iii. 7. 1 John ii. 25. v. 11, 13.
p Rom. ii. 7. John x. 28, 29.

learned, as well as the learned, can perceive that *aionios* means *absolutely eternal*. This might never have been disputed, but for the sake of the remaining six, which read as follows. "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, "hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of *eternal damna-* "*tion*." "Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about "them, in like manner, giving themselves over to fornica- "tion, and going after strange flesh, are set forth an exam- "ple, suffering the vengeance of *eternal fire*." "Who shall "be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence "of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." "It is bet- "ter for thee to enter into life halt or maimed; rather than "having two hands or two feet, to be cast into *everlasting* "*fire*." "Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, de- "part from me ye cursed, into *everlasting fire*, prepared for "the devil and his angels." "And these shall go away into "*everlasting punishment*, but the righteous into *life eternal*."[q]

The note which my opponent has, without giving credit, copied from the Improved Version, on the first of these texts, was worth so little, that he appears to have stolen it merely to keep his hand in.[r] Concerning the *eternal fire*, mentioned in the second text, he speaks as follows, viz. "It is said to "be set forth as an example to others, that they may avoid a "similar fate. Now, I ask you, my hearers, admitting the "meaning my opponent attaches to it were true, can that "which takes place in an invisible world, be an example to "those who exist here, and who have never seen any thing "of it, nor any who came from thence?—It is said to be set "forth: of course it must be something that is brought into "view, and not that which is hidden. The apostle says, (2 "Pet. ii. 6,) 'And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomor- "'rah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, mak- "'ing them an ensample unto those that after should live "'ungodly.' Now, I ask, what fire was *set forth* as an ex- "ample to other nations, who should *afterwards* live un- "godly? Could it be the fire of my opponent's Hell in an- "other world, which was set forth as an example to those "who should live here as the inhabitants of Sodom and Go- "morrah? No, my hearers, it was the fire which destroyed "those cities, and continued to the days of the apostle, which "is here meant." At the same time, he quotes from Scarlett,

---

q Mk. iii. 29. Jude 7. 2 Thess. i. 9. Matt. xviii. 8. xxv. 41, 46.

r He has made an unimportant alteration of a few words, to make it his own; as some men take possession of their neighbour's settle, after altering their marks.

who professed to quote from Whitby, that "This fire lasted "from Abraham's time, till after the apostolic age; and was "burning in the time of Philo Judæus, the beginning of the "second century." In his Lectures, he tells us, from Scarlett, that this fire "lasted upwards of two thousand years," "but is now extinct."[s]

The substance of the above argument is this;—Nothing can be set forth as an example, but that which is submitted to occular inspection;—But Sodom and Gomorrha "are set "forth an example, suffering the vengeance of *aionian fire*;"—Therefore, this *aionian fire* must mean that visible fire which lasted upwards of two thousand years, but is now extinct; Wherefore, it cannot be an absolutely eternal fire. My opponent says, "It is set forth: of course, it must be something "that is brought into view; and not that which is hidden." "Can that which takes place in an invisible world be an ex-"ample to those who exist here, and who have never seen "any thing of it, nor any who came from thence?"

But, in reply to these sage remarks, I would observe, that he would not believe it, if one were to come from thence. For God has said, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, "neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the "dead." But is it true, that nothing can be set forth as an example, but that which is seen? James says, "Take, my "brethren, the prophets, who have spoken in the name of "the Lord, for an example of suffering affliction, and of pa-"tience."[t] Had James or those to whom he wrote, ever seen these prophets? Concerning the destruction of the Israelites in the wilderness, Paul writes to the Corinthians, "Now "these things were our examples, to the intent we should "not lust after evil things, as they also lusted." "Now all "these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they "are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of "the world are come."[u] Had Paul or the Corinthians ever seen the carnage in the wilderness? Moreover; in the text quoted above by my opponent, Peter says that God has made the case of Sodom and Gomorrha "an ensample unto those "that after should live ungodly." Is it an example to no ungodly person that has not seen the fire?

The manner in which Universalists contradict themselves and one another on this text in Jude, looks unfavourably.

---

s Minutes, p. 274. Lectures, p. 207.
t Jas. v. 10.
u 1 Cor. x. 6, 11.

My Opponent, using a stale quibble, observes that "the term "*aionion* is not connected with the suffering which they en-"dured, but with the fire which destroyed them." It has been shewn that elsewhere, the Improved Version used this same sophism. But here it contradicts itself as well as my Opponent. Instead of telling us that it is only the fire that is eternal, it says in a note, that it is "*everlasting* in its effects; the "cities having been finally destroyed." What are the effects of suffering the vengeance of everlasting fire, has been shewn in treating the word *fire*, under the term *Gehenna*. The same thing is established by what was there said of the scriptural words *destruction* and *damnation*. All these words occur in the texts quoted above, where *aionios* is connected with punishment. In one of them it is said that sinners "shall be punished with *everlasting destruction*." On this text Mr. Ballou says, "That which is destroyed, I grant, is endlessly de-"stroyed;"[v] insinuating that it is sin only, and not the sinner. What is the subject of destruction, let the whole passage decide. "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven, "with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance "on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel "of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with *ever-"lasting destruction*." If language can be understood, then this passage declares that men who reject the gospel, shall be destroyed: therefore, according to Mr. Ballou's proposition, these sinners will be endlessly destroyed; or, (as another text expresses it,) go away into everlasting punishment.

In the text here alluded to, (Matt. xxv. 46,) the same word is used to mark the eternity of the sinner's punishment, which is used in the same sentence to declare the eternity of the saint's happiness. "And there shall go away into *aionian punishment*, but the righteous into *aionian life*:" and there is no reason, except the mere wish of the wicked, for explaining the one to mean a limited duration, more than the other. There is, however, the best possible reason for denying that it is to be so understood in either case. This takes place at the day of judgment; when measured periods are all merged in an absolute eternity. All temporal lives have expired, all earthly dispensations are abrogated; these visible heavens are rolled up as a scroll, and the elements are melted with fervent heat. "Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but

---

v On Atonement, p. 179. 2 Thess. i. 7—10.

"also heaven. And this word, yet once more, signifieth "the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things "that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken "may remain."[w]

It is not at all surprising, that my opponent and his brethren deny that there is to be a day of judgment, after death. That infidelity, which is willing to wear a disguise, considers nothing too sacred for its polluted fingers. The reason which they give, for applying the xxvth chapter of Matthew to temporal events, is, that there is some appearance of the same thing being done by our Saviour, in Matt. xvi. 27, 28. "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, "with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some "standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see "the Son of man coming in his kingdom:" or as Luke says, "till they see the kingdom of God:" or as Mark says, "till "they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Again he says, in predicting the destruction of Jerusalem, "But in those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be "darkened, and the moon shall not give her light; and the "stars of heaven shall fall, and the powers that are in heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of "man coming in the clouds, with great power and glory. "And then shall he send his angels, and shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the uttermost part "of the earth, to the uttermost part of heaven." "Verily I "say unto you, that this generation shall not pass, till all "these things be done."[x]

Here are predictions of the coming of Christ, in glory, with his angels, to gather all his elect, and reward every man according to his works. It is to be accompanied with the darkening of the sun, moon, and stars: which we consider to belong to the general judgment. Yet it is said that all these things shall be fulfilled before the demise of that generation, to which these prophecies were addressed. These are among the craggy cliffs of revelation, which many survey, but few surmount. The obstacles are often of our own making. Instead of seeking for the mind of the Spirit, by comparing spiritual things with spiritual, men often measure the Sacred Oracles by rules of human invention, and thus create difficulties, where things would otherwise be plain.

w Heb. xii. 26, 27.
x Luke ix. 27. Mk. ix. 1. xiii. 24—27, 30.

That many prophecies have a primary and an ultimate fulfilment, is too evident to require elaborate proof. Before Samson's birth, God told the mother of this well known type of Christ, "The child shall be a Nazarite." This had a subordinate fulfilment a short time after the prophecy was uttered: but its grand accomplishment is recorded in the New Testament. "And he came and dwelt in a city called "Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by "the prophets, he shall be called NADZORAIOS, *a Naza-* "*rite.*"[y] So the above predictions had an inceptive accomplishment in that generation to which they were addressed. They contemplated the resurrection of Christ from the dead, his glorious ascension into heaven, the powerful effusion of his Holy Spirit, and the gathering of his elect into the visible church, under the administration of his apostles and other ministers, in every part of the then known world. There was also such a judging of the sheep and the goats, according to their works, as was foretold by Ezekiel; when it is said, "I "will feed them with judgment. And as for you, O my flock! "thus saith the Lord God; behold I will judge between cat- "tle and cattle, between the rams and the he-goats."[z] Such a discrimination was made in the destruction of Jerusalem: which awful event, was, according to the account of Josephus, accompanied with such preternatural phenomena, in the heavens and the earth, as might well be designated by the darkening of the sun, moon, and stars.

But surely the fallen angels were not destroyed with Jerusalem. Jude must therefore have referred to some other event, when he told us that they were "reserved in everlast- "ing chains under darkness, unto the *judgment of the great* "*day.*" The Scriptures say moreover, concerning men, "Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, "to execute judgment upon all." "We shall all stand before "the judgment-seat of Christ." A similar passage of the same writer is thus paraphrased by Macknight. "For we "must all [at the last day,] appear [in the body] before the "tribunal of [the Lord] Christ, that every one [of us] may "receive [from him,] rewards and punishments in the body, "according to what he hath done [in the body] whether what "he hath done be good or bad." "Behold he cometh with "clouds, and every eye shall see him." "The Son of man

---

y Judges xiii. 5. Matt. ii. 23. Thus it is explained by Diodati, Dr. Clarke, and Parkhurst. See the latter on the word.

z Ez. xxxiv. 17.

"shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his "kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity." "So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall "come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just." "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the "judgment." "For the Lord himself shall descend from "heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the arch-angel, and "with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise "first. Then we which are alive, and remain, shall be caught "up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in "the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." "The "Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty "angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that "know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Je-"sus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruc-"tion from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of "his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, "and to be admired in all them that believe."[a]

As Canaan was a type of heaven, so was the destruction of Jerusalem, a figure of the day of judgment: thus it is as reasonable to confine all that is said of future happiness to the land of Canaan, as to restrict all the above texts to the temporal judgments by which Jerusalem fell. In those passages, men and devils are the subjects of this judgment; and it takes place at the end of the world, after the great body of mankind have died and arisen again: and those believers which are alive when the trumpet sounds, shall be caught up in the clouds, together with the risen saints, to dwell with Christ forever. The same authorities agree with the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, and that of the talented servants, and many other passages of scripture, in making a complete separation between the righteous and the wicked, and sending the latter to *eternal destruction*. That this is the doctrine of Matthew xxvth, must be plain to the candid reader of God's word. "When the Son of man shall "come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then "shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him "shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them "one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from "the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, "but the goats on the left. Then shall the king say unto "them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, in-

a Jude vii 14, 15. Rom. xiv. 10. 2 Cor. v. 10. Rev. i. 7. Matt. xiii. 41, 49. Heb. ix. 27. 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17. 2 Thess. i. 7—10.

"herit the kingdom prepared for you, from the foundation "of the world" "Then shall he say also unto them on the "left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into *everlasting* fire, "prepared for the devil and his angels." "And these shall "go away into *everlasting* punishment, but the righteous into "*everlasting* life."[b] With a becoming deference to the good sense of this audience, and especially with a sacred regard to the authority of God, speaking in his word, I must conclude, that those texts, in which *aionios* is connected with the punishment of the wicked, should be considered *affirmative* evidence of the *absolute eternity* of that punishment.

RECAPITULATION.

With the help of Almighty God, I have now endeavoured to shew the meaning of his word, in support of the truth, and in answer to objections which are made against it: whether these objections were drawn from the present character and sufferings of mankind, the general offer of salvation, or the attributes of God; whether they related to purgatory, or restitution, or fatherly chastisements; or whether they contemplated the will of God, or Christ's prophetic, kingly, or priestly office.

The doctrine for which the church of God has ever contended, has been fairly *inferred* from the scriptural account of God's milder and severer attributes, and the guilty, depraved, and helpless condition of mankind. It has been shewn that this doctrine is often *implied*, in the use of such scriptural figures as *insinuation*, *supposition*, and *interrogation*. This doctrine has been also established, by the contrast which the scriptures mark, between the righteous and the wicked, in relation to their character, standing and future destiny: and by scriptural *negations*, or denials that there is any end to the punishment of the wicked.

The *affirmative* evidence was divided into two branches: the first of which related to *the state of the damned*. In this, the doctrine was proved by those scriptures which threaten the wicked, with the punishment of hell; whether by the name of *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Gehenna*, or *Tartarus*. The second branch of this argument related to *the duration of punishment*, and was founded on texts which declare that this punishment is *eternal*, or shall last *forever*; whether the writers

b Matt. xxv. 31—34, 41, 46.

convey their ideas in Hebrew or Greek; whether by *nej od*, or *olam*; or by *aion*. *eis aiona*, or *aionios*.

The texts belonging to the last branch of the last argument, assure us that some have their portion in the mist of darkness,—in the blackness of darkness,—in the lake of fire and brimstone,—in the smoke of torment,—in confusion, shame, contempt, reproach, destruction, damnation. And this is declared, in the unlimited sense of the words, to be forever, for ever and ever, everlasting, perpetual, eternal. While a God of infinite truth speaks such language, his people must believe, that he will punish the finally impenitent and unbelieving, to an absolute eternity.

CONCLUSION.

This point of faith, like all other articles of the Christian creed, is calculated, through grace, to promote the temporal welfare and the eternal salvation of men. It is rash for its enemies to impeach its moral tendency. Yet my opponent has just now insinuated, that its advocates do not entirely agree with the apostle, in his wish that all "may lead a "quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness, and honesty," but that they would allow of a little turbulence, a little impiety, and a little dishonesty.[c] Now that I think of it, I should be obliged to that lady, who sent me this fan, which has yielded me so much refreshment during this debate, if she would, when convenient, have the kindness to let me know, how it may be returned to its owner. As far as I understand the principles in question, they have, through the Spirit of Christ, a tendency to preserve their possessors from dishonesty, even to the value of a fan or a pin. Insinuations of this sort, come with a peculiarly ill grace from Universalists, and especially from that sect to which my opponent belongs. An inquiry into the connexion of principles and practice, will, by no means, redound to their honour. For the general promotion of piety, sobriety, and honesty, men should have correct views of their moral disease, and of the remedy which God has appointed for it. The scriptures put in requisition, all the resources of language, in order to describe the malignity and odiousness of sin, and the love and condescension of God, in the cross of Christ; by which we are crucified to the world, and the world to us. Yet my opponent's religion makes sin a mere negation, and the atone-

c Minutes p. 299.

ment a downright imposition. "They that be whole need not "a physician, but they that are sick." Those who make a mock at sin, will not apply to a divine Saviour, for pardon and sanctification: and without him they will never be truly wise, holy or upright. Their practice supports this position. Universalism never was known to reform a sinner: but it has been the means of depraving many a sober man, and of blasting the fair prospects of many a family. Universalism never attempts to mortify the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life; while all its energies are exerted, to keep men from being too religious themselves, and from labouring for the conversion of others.

If ever piety, purity, and righteousness were found on earth, they have been found in the blood-bought church of Christ. Yet this church has ever held, with an unyielding pertinacity, the eternity of future rewards and punishments. They have ever viewed sin with abhorrence, and have preferred truth and holiness, to the enjoyment of reputation, property, or life. Permit one who has tasted the bitterness of sin, to add his feeble testimony to their general voice. Although I have conscientiously defended the truth, with a desire for your salvation, if God were to judge me, out of Christ, I am lost for ever. I have committed sin enough in this debate, to damn a world, if it were imputed to it. If God were to lay justice to the line, and righteousness to the plummet, and deal with me, independently of Christ's atonement, I confess that I cannot answer for the way in which I advocate his cause, or call upon his name. It is this which endears to me the cross of Christ, and it is this which makes my heart bleed with compassion for your precious souls. The pleasure of serving your spiritual interests, has far outweighed that bodily sickness and weakness which has excited your sympathy. In the truth, there is an indescribable loveliness: and in the sweet hope, that God will bless his word, to your conviction, conversion, and edification, there is an unspeakable comfort. My flesh and my heart fail; but thou, O God, art the strength of my heart, and my portion forever.

ERRATA.

In page 142, line 20, for *This* read *The.*
146, line 4 from bottom, for *has* read *hast.*
150, line 15, for *in Rom. 8th* read *on Rom. 8th.*
172, line 12, for *charm* read *chain.*
176, line 12, for *several* read *severer*
183, note, before *kindness* insert *professional.*
208, line 16, for *that* read *than.*
225, line 29, for *mead* read *meed.*

ADVERTISEMENT.

DISCUSSION OF BAPTISM.

In June, 1820, there was, in Mount Pleasant, Jefferson county, Ohio, a public debate on Baptism, between Mr. John Walker, a minister of the Associate Church. and Mr. Alexander Campbell, an Arian Baptist. At the close of that conference, Mr Campbell spoke as follows, viz. "I have now "accepted the invitation or challenge of the Seceders, and having now fully "satisfied their most eager desires for an interview of this kind, I conceive "it is my time to give an *invitation* or *challenge* to *any Pedo-Baptist mi-* "*nister;* and to return the compliment with the utmost ceremoniousness, "I this day publish to all present, that I feel disposed to meet any Pedo- "Baptist minister of any denomination, of good standing in his party, and "I engage to prove in a debate with him, either *viva voce*, or with the pen, "that *Infant Sprinkling is a human tradition, and injurious to the well-* "*being of society religious and political.* I have to add, that I must have "an equal vote, in determining the time and place. This is the only re- "striction I attach to *the challenge* I now publish." This professed *challenge*, as its author repeatedly calls it, was published in Mr. Campbell's printed account of the debate, which Mr. Walker afterward proved to be spurious. In consequence of an application from an important friend and partizan of Mr. Campbell's, I was induced, in the year 1823, to send him an acceptance of his challenge. This introduced a correspondence, which terminated in a public conference of seven days in Washington, Mason county, Kentucky, in October 1823. There was no stenographer engaged. Yet Mr. Campbell has been so kind as to write a volume of speeches for me, without my ever thinking of imposing such a task upon him. If God permit, the merits of his performance, and the character and testimony of his friends who have aided him, and certified for him, may be the subject of free animadversion, hereafter. This controversy is as interesting in Kentucky, as Universalism is in Philadelphia. The reason is, that Arianism and all other evils, are brought in under the cloak of Anti-Pedobaptism. Real Christian Baptists are the objects of my sincere love. Among them, I have dear relatives and friends in the West and in the East. Mr. Campbell would deprive me of their friendship by writing speeches for me. When Providence will permit me, in consistency with pastoral duties, and a proper regard to health, it is my earnest wish, and my fixed design to publish my own argument, with Mr. Campbell, as I have with Mr. Kneeland. And that I have the means of doing it, Mr. Campbell well knows, since he made as frequent and as doleful complaints of my little book, as did the Universalist champion. Meanwhile I wish it to be understood that I do not consider myself responsible for the follies which Mr. Campbell may forge for me.

W. L. M'G.

THE

ARTICLES

OF THE

SYNOD OF DORT,

AND ITS

REJECTION OF ERRORS:

WITH THE

HISTORY OF EVENTS WHICH MADE WAY FOR THAT SYNOD,

AS PUBLISHED BY THE

AUTHORITY OF THE STATES-GENERAL;

AND THE

DOCUMENTS CONFIRMING ITS DECISIONS.

Translated from the Latin,

WITH

NOTES, REMARKS, AND REFERENCES,

BY THOMAS SCOTT,

RECTOR OF ASTON SANDFORD, BUCKS.

"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh "and searcheth him."—*Prov.* xviii. 7.

"Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment."—*John* vii. 24.

Audi alteram partem.

London:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

By A. MACINTOSH, London Society's Office, Spitalfields:

AND SOLD BY

L. B. SEELEY, FLEET STREET; AND J. HATCHARD, PICCADILLY.

1818.

Price 6s.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE	v—viii
I. PREFACE TO THE REFORMED CHURCHES; in which the rise and progress of those controversies in Belgium, for the removal of which this Synod was especially held, are briefly and faithfully related	1—100
INTRODUCTION to this Preface and the History contained in it, by the Author	1—7
THE HISTORY (a translation with notes)	8—100
II. THE JUDGMENT of the National Synod of the reformed Belgick churches held at Dort, A. D. 1618, 1619; at which very many Theologians of the reformed churches of Great Britain, Germany, and France were present; concerning the five heads of doctrine, controverted in the Belgick churches. (Published May 5, 1619.)	101—105
Remarks on this JUDGMENT	105—110
III. ARTICLES OF THE SYNOD OF DORT, &c.	111—176
Introductory Remarks	111—112
CHAPTER I. On the doctrine of divine Predestination, in eighteen articles, (with Notes and References)	112—120
These eighteen articles, as abbreviated by Tilenus, and reported by Heylin, in one article, (with a remark)	120—121
Rejection of Errors, by which the Belgick churches have for some time been disturbed, (with Notes and References)	121—127
CHAPTER II. On the doctrine of the death of Christ, and through it of the Redemption of Man, in nine articles, (with Notes, &c.)	128—130
Abbreviation (in one article) by Tilenus and Heylin	130
Rejection of Errors on the Second Chapter, in seven articles (with Notes, &c.)	131—134
CHAPTERS III. and IV. On the doctrine of Man's corruption, and on the method of his conversion to God; in seventeen articles, (with Notes, &c.)	135—142
Abbreviation by Tilenus and Heylin, in two articles	142, 143
Rejection of Errors on the third and fourth chapters, in nine articles (with Notes, &c.)	143—148

PAGE

CHAPTER V. Of Doctrine.—Concerning the perseverance of the saints, in fifteen articles, (with Notes, &c.) ..... 149—154
Abbreviation by Tilenus and Heylin in one article, with their conclusion, and a remark upon it..... 154, 155
Rejection of Errors on the fifth chapter, concerning the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, in nine articles, (with Notes, &c.) ..... 155—159
CONCLUSION, (with Notes, &c.)..... 159—162
THE DECISION OF THE SYNOD, concerning the Remonstrants 162—166
Remarks on this decision .... 167—176

IV. THE APPROBATION OF THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND VERY POWERFUL LORDS THE STATES-GENERAL ..... 176—179
Concluding remarks on this APPROBATION..... 179—185

PREFACE.

THE manner in which the author was brought to the determination, of adding the present work to all his former publications, will appear more fully in the introduction to the articles of the Synod of Dordrecht, or Dort. In general, he had erroneously adopted, and aided in circulating, a gross misrepresentation of the Synod and its decisions, in his 'Remarks on the Refutation of Calvinism;' and, having discovered his mistake previously to the publication of a second edition of that work, he was induced to do what he could, to counteract that misrepresentation, and to vindicate the Synod from the atrocious calumnies, with which it has been wilfully or inadvertently traduced. But other motives concurred in disposing him, to giving his attempt its present form and order.

1. A very interesting and important part of ecclesiastical history has been obscured and overwhelmed in unmerited disgrace, by the misrepresentations given of this Synod and its articles, especially in this nation; in which very few, even among studious men, know accurately the circumstances which led to the convening of this Synod, and the real nature and import of its decisions. To excite therefore

others, more conversant in these studies, and better qualified for the service, to examine this part of ecclesiastical history, and to do impartial justice to it, is one object which the author has in view.

2. He purposes to prove, that the doctrines commonly termed Calvinistick, whether they be or be not the doctrines of scriptural Christianity, may yet be so stated and explained, without any skilful or laboured efforts, as to coincide with the strictest practical views of our holy religion; and so as greatly to encourage and promote genuine holiness, considered in its most expanded nature, and in its effects on all our tempers, affections, words, and actions, in relation to God and to all mankind.

3. In a day when these doctrines are not only proscribed in a most hostile manner on one side, but deplorably misunderstood and perverted by many on the other side; the author desired to add one more testimony against these misapprehensions and perversions, by shewing in what a holy, guarded, and reverential manner, the divines of this reprobated Synod, stated and explained these doctrines; compared with the superficial, incautious, and often unholy and presumptuous manner of too many in the present day. And if any individual, or a few individuals, should by this publication, be induced to employ superior talents and advantages, in counteracting these unscriptural and pernicious statements, his labour will be amply compensated.

4. The author desired to make it manifest, that

the deviations from the creeds of the reformed churches in those points which are more properly called Calvinistick, is seldom, for any length of time, kept separate from deviations in those doctrines, which are more generally allowed to be essential to vital Christianity. It must, indeed, appear from the history with which the work begins, that the progress is easy and almost unavoidable, from the controversial opposition to personal election, to the explaining away of original sin, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, justification by faith alone, and even of the atonement and deity of Christ: and that the opponents of the Synod of Dort, and the Remonstrants in general, were far more favourable to Pelagians, nay, to Socinians, than to Calvinists; and were almost universally unsound, in what are commonly called orthodox doctrines, and many of them far from conscientious in their conduct. Indeed, it will appear undeniable, that the opposition, made to them by the Contra-Remonstrants, was much more decidedly on these grounds, than because they opposed the doctrine of personal election, and the final perseverance of true believers as connected with it.

5. The author purposed also, by means of this publication, to leave behind him, in print, his deliberate judgment on several controverted points, which must otherwise have died with him, or have been published separately, for which he had no inclination. But he has here grafted them as notes or remarks on the several parts of this work; and he trusts he has now done with all controversy.

It is doubtless vain, to attempt any thing, against many of those opponents, who succeed to each other, with sufficient variety, as to the grounds on which they take their stand, and from which they make the assault; but in some respects nearly in the same course of misapprehension, or misrepresentation, as to the real sentiments of those, whom they undertake to refute. It suffices to say of them, "Neither can "they prove the things of which they accuse us:" and to say to them, "Thou shalt not bear false "witness against thy neighbour." But indeed Calvinists seem to be no more considered as *neighbours* by many Anti-Calvinists, than the publicans, Samaritans, and Gentiles, were by the Scribes and Pharisees!

After all that has been published on these subjects, the groundless charges brought by many against the whole body, cannot be considered as excusable misapprehension. They must be either intentional misrepresentation; or the inexcusable presumption of writing on subjects, which the writers have never studied, and against persons, and descriptions of persons, of whose tenets, amidst most abundant means of information, they remain wilfully ignorant. A fair and impartial opponent is entitled to respect, but I can only *pity* such controversialists.

THOMAS SCOTT.

Aston Sandford,
March 15, 1818.

THE

PREFACE,

TO THE REFORMED CHURCHES OF CHRIST,

IN WHICH THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF THOSE CONTROVERSIES IN BELGIUM, FOR THE REMOVAL OF WHICH THIS SYNOD WAS ESPECIALLY HELD, ARE BRIEFLY AND FAITHFULLY RELATED.

INTRODUCTION TO THIS PREFACE.

BY THE AUTHOR.

IN perusing this preface, and the history contained in it, the reader should especially recollect, that it was drawn up and published by the authority and with the sanction of the States General, and the Prince of Orange, as well as by that of the Synod itself; and that, in every part of it, the *acts*, or publick records in which the events recorded were registered, are referred to, with the exact dates of each transaction. No history can therefore be attested as authentick, in a more satisfactory and unexceptionable manner: for, whatever degree of colouring prejudices or partiality may be supposed to have given to the narration; it can hardly be conceived, that collective bodies, and individuals filling up such conspicuous and exalted stations, would expressly attest any thing *directly false;* and then appeal to authorities, by which the falsehood of their statement might at any time be detected and exposed. It should also be remembered, that prejudices and partiality would be as likely to colour the account given to the world, and transmitted to posterity by the opposite party; while the very

circumstances, in which they were placed, would render it impracticable for them to substantiate the authenticity of their narrative in the same manner. Yet, contrary to all rules of a sober and unbiassed judgment, the unauthenticated histories of the Remonstrants* concerning the Synod of Dort have, almost exclusively, been noticed and credited by posterity, especially in this country, to the neglect of the authentick records.† In giving the translation of this history I would merely say, *Audi alteram partem.* 'Do not read the authenticated narration with greater suspicions of unfairness than you do those, which are not so fully authenticated. Let not your approbation of what you suppose to have been the doctrine of the Remonstrants, or your aversion to that of the Contra-Remonstrants, bias your mind in this respect; but judge impartially.' One of these histories was drawn up by a man, (Heylin,) who has been fully detected of misrepresenting the very articles of the Synod, in the grossest manner; and has thus misled great numbers to mistake entirely the real import and nature of the decisions made by it. I appeal to the abbreviation, as it is called, of the Articles of the Synod of Dort, as compared with the real Articles themselves, in another part of this publication. So scandalous a misrepresentation, which has been too implicitly adopted by many others,

* So called from a Remonstrance presented by them to the States of Holland and West Friesland, against the doctrines of their opponents, or those of the Federated churches of Belgium.

† Neither Mosheim, nor his translator Maclaine, mention this history, while they refer to a variety of authorities on both sides of the question, in their narrative of these transactions. So that it is even probable that they had never seen it. Whether the severe measures by which the decisions of this Synod were followed up; and especially the strict prohibition of printing or vending any other account, in Latin, Dutch, or French, in the Federated provinces, during seven years, without a special licence for that purpose; did not eventually conduce to this, may be a question. The measure, however, was impolitick, if not unjustifiable.

should render the impartial reader cautious in giving implicit credit to other statements made by the same party, however celebrated the names of some of them may be.

When I first entered on this part of my undertaking, I purposed merely to give a short *abstract* of the history, just enough to render the subsequent part of the work intelligible to the less learned or studious reader: but, whether it were the result of partiality, or of unbiassed judgment, I found myself so deeply interested in the events recorded, (which were almost entirely new to me,) that my reluctancy to translating and transcribing the whole was overcome: and, (with a few remarks on different parts) I determined to give it entire, to the English reader. As far as I am competent to judge, it possesses every internal evidence of authenticity and fairness: and of *impartiality*, as far as even pious men, exactly circumstanced as the writers were, in the present imperfect state of human nature, can be expected to be impartial.—It is, I think, also drawn up, with a degree of calmness and moderation; far different from that fierce and fiery zeal, which is generally supposed to belong to all, who profess, or are suspected, of what many in a very vague and inappropriate manner call, Calvinism. And though according to the *fashion* of those times, epithets are in some instances applied both to men and opinions, which modern courtesy, nay, perhaps Christian meekness, would have suppressed; yet, if I mistake not, they are *more* sparingly employed in this, than in any contemporary controversial publication. Indeed the higher points of what is called Calvinism, are far less insisted on, and the opponents of those points far more moderately censured, than might have been expected; while the doctrines commonly called orthodox, as opposed by Pelagians, Arians, and Socinians, are strongly maintained, and the opposers of them strenuously, nay, severely, condemned. Even

Mosheim allows, that the triumph of the Synod was that of the Sublapsarians, not only over the Arminians, but over the Supralapsarians also.*

In order to the impartial reading of this history, it should be previously recollected, and well considered, that all the Belgick churches were, from the first, Presbyterian, in government and discipline; and constituted according to that plan, with presbyteries, classes, provincial Synods, and general Synods of all the Federated provinces; and with all those rules and methods for admission into the ministry, and to the pastoral charge in distinct congregations; as also to situations in Universities and schools of learning, which form a constituent part of it; as well as of that strict discipline, connected with it, implying not only excommunication of lay-members, but the suspension, or silencing of pastors; and excluding from their office, academical teachers and professors on account of heresy in doctrine, and gross inconsistency of conduct, proved against them in their classes, or Synods. Through the whole history, it appears, that no other form of government was proposed even by the Remonstrants; nor any thing mentioned about *toleration* in that respect; though their measures evidently tended to subvert the whole system. All the funds likewise, reserved for religious purposes, were appropriated entirely in consistency with the Presbyterian model; and all academical honours and distinctions were conferred in that line.

This, beyond doubt, having been the case; and the principal persons concerned in the controversy against the Remonstrants, having been *zealously*, and (most of them at least) *conscientiously* attached to this system; so that it appeared to them, as if the very interest of vital religion was intimately, if not inseparably, connected with it: he must, I say, be a most unreasonable, and partial Anti-pres-

* Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, vol. v. p. 368.

byterian, who can expect from men of this stamp, that they would permit their whole system, and all its operations, to be retarded, disturbed, nay, totally deranged and subverted, and the whole state of their churches thrown into confusion and anarchy, without vigorous struggles to prevent a catastrophe, in their view so deplorable and ruinous. Even in this age and land few persons, of supposed candour and liberality of mind, either among zealous Episcopalians, or Independents, seem inclined tamely to witness the subversion of their favourite system, without employing the most effectual means of preventing it, which are fairly within their reach. Indeed it is not in human nature, and cannot reasonably be expected. Nor, till men are convinced, that it is not the cause of God, nor essential to that of true religion, would it be right thus to yield it up to their opponents. But when measures of this nature are adopted, at first simply in self-defence, against aggressors, in order to preserve advantages, already possessed by law and custom; it must also be expected, that, in the eagerness of a violent and protracted contest, even conscientious men, will, through remaining prejudices and evil passions, excited and irritated by what they judge injurious usage, be betrayed into some unjustifiable measures, of which their opponents will make great advantage, and which even impartial spectators cannot justify or excuse. If then this should appear to have been the case in the Belgick contest, with the opposers of the Remonstrants; as well as with the Remonstrants themselves: it ought neither to excite our surprise, nor prejudice us so deeply against the whole company, as, on account of it, to involve them in one sweeping sentence of condemnation.

Again, it is well known, at least it is capable of the most complete proof, in respect of the doctrines controverted during this period in Belgium; that the Confession and Catechism of the Belgick churches, were entirely on the side

of the Contra-Remonstrants. Their appeal is constantly made to those articles; not under the disadvantage, in which some of us in England appeal to the articles of our established church, while our opponents, with a degree of plausibility interpret them in a different meaning; but, as to the very documents, to which the Remonstrants objected, nay, which they vehemently and openly opposed, both in their sermons and publick writings. So that their concessions and requisitions, in this respect, put the matter beyond all denial or doubt, to him that has carefully examined the history. This will fully appear as we proceed. Now he must be a most unreasonable and unfair advocate for the Remonstrants; who would require decided and conscientious Contra-Remonstrants, holding responsible stations in the Belgick churches, universities, and schools, by virtue of their subscription to this Confession and Catechism, to suffer, without any effort to the contrary, those documents to be opposed, proscribed, and vilified; and contrary doctrines promulgated, even by persons, who generally held their situations in the same manner: while the opposers of the established doctrines indefatigably laboured and employed all their influence with those in authority, to set them aside and introduce the contrary doctrines; and this by the authority of the civil governments alone, to the exclusion of that ecclesiastical power, by which they in great measure had been supported. Such a passive acquiescence would not, I apprehend, be found at this day, if eager opponents should put the matter to the trial, either among decided Episcopalians, or Lutherans, or any others, who are cordially attached to their own views of Christianity. How far the defenders of the Belgick Confession and Catechism used, exclusively, "weapons of "warfare not carnal, but mighty through God," is another question. It can scarcely be doubted, but there were faults on both sides, in this vehement contest; but I cannot think

in an equal degree. Let the candid enquirer read and judge for himself.

In translating this history, and the other documents which I now lay before the publick, I make no pretensions to any thing beyond *fairness* and *exactness*, in giving the meaning of the original. Had I been disposed to aim at it, I do not think myself competent to the office of translating in such a manner, as to invest the Latin, fairly and fully, with the entire idiom of the English language: but I have even by design, confined myself more closely to *literal* translation, than I should have done, in an attempt less connected with controversy: and have often declined giving a more approved English word or expression; when I feared, it might be suspected of not exactly conveying the sense of the original. Indeed, as far as it could be made consistent with perspicuity, I have rather *preserved* than *shunned* the Latin idiom, where any doubt could remain as to the idea, which the writers intended to convey. And, when after all, I had any apprehension that I had not fully accomplished this, I have given in a parenthesis, the Latin word, that the reader may judge for himself.—In other places, a parenthesis often contains a word not found in the Latin, but useful in elucidating the meaning. My sole desire has been, to render the whole clearly understood by the English reader: and to call the attention of pious and reflecting persons to a part of Ecclesiastical history, which I am confident has been generally less known, and more grossly misrepresented by some, and mistaken by others, than any other part whatever has been: but which, I am also persuaded, is peculiarly replete with important useful instruction; especially to zealous Calvinists, who may here learn in what a guarded, and holy, and *practical* manner, these generally *reprobated* theologians, stated and defended their tenets; and on what grounds, exclusively scriptural, they rested them.

THE HISTORY.

IN the course of the last summer, the decision of the venerable Synod, lately held at Dordrecht (or Dort) concerning some heads of doctrine, which had hitherto been disputed in the Belgick churches, with the greatest disturbance of the same, was published, having been comprised in certain distinct canons. And as this most celebrated Synod had been called together, by the Illustrious and most mighty the States General, the supreme magistracy of the federated provinces, especially for the removal of the controversies, which had arisen in religion, the most of them judged that it would be sufficient, if merely the determination of the Synod, concerning these same controversies were published. But when it afterwards was evident, that there were very many, who greatly desired further to know, from the very acts of the Synod, what besides these things, had been done in the Synod; and by what method, especially with the Remonstrant pastors: and when it was not doubtful, but that they themselves, in order to veil their own pertinacity, were about to publish some things concerning these matters, not with the best fidelity, it pleased the Illustrious and most mighty the States General, that the acts also of the same Synod, faithfully transcribed from the publick registers (*tabulis*) should be published in print, for the satisfaction (*in gratiam*) and use of the churches. And as in these (records) many things every where occur, which pertain to the history of the things transacted in the Belgick churches, and which could less advantageously be understood or judged of, by readers who were ignorant of these things: for which cause even the national Synod, (as it may be seen in the different sessions,) sometimes enjoined, especially on the deputies of the South Holland churches, to write a brief narrative of the affairs transacted with the Remon-

strants: it seemed good to prefix, in the place of a preface, from it, (that history) some things, which were publickly transacted; that the foreign churches especially, might for once know with good fidelity, what was the rise and progress of these controversies; and on what occasion, and for what causes, the Illustrious and most mighty the States General convened this most celebrated Synod, at a very great expence;* especially, when many things are related by the Remonstrants, in writings exhibited, and here inserted, which less accord with the truth of the things transacted.

In the Reformed churches of Federated Belgium, how great an agreement had, in the preceding age, flourished, on all the heads of orthodox doctrine, among the pastors and doctors, of the Belgick churches; and moreover how great order and decorum (εὐλαξεια and συσχημοσυνη) had always been preserved in the government of the same, is too well known to the Christian world, for it to be needful to set it forth in many words. This peace and harmony of the Belgick churches, lovely (in itself,) and most pleasing to God and all pious men, certain persons had attempted to disturb, with unbridled violence, but not with great success: (persons) who having deserted popery, but not being yet fully purified from its leaven, had passed over into our churches, and had been admitted into the ministry in the same, during that first scarcity of ministers: (namely) Caspius Coolhasius, of Leyda, Herman Herbertius, of Dordrecht,

* 'After long and tedious debates, which were frequently attended 'with popular tumults and civil broils, this intricate controversy was, 'by the counsels and authority of Maurice, prince of Orange, referred 'to the decision of the church, assembled in a general Synod at Dor-'drecht, in the year 1618.' *(Mosheim.)*—'It was not by the authority 'of prince Maurice, but by that of the States General, that the na-'tional Synod was assembled at Dordrecht. The States were not indeed 'unanimous; three of the seven provinces protested against the holding 'of this Synod, viz. Holland, Utrecht, and Overyssel.' *(Maclaine.)* Mosheim's History, vol. v. p. 367.

and Gouda, and Cornelius Wiggerus, of Horn. For in the same places, in which they had got some persons too little favouring the reformed religion, on whose patronage they relied: this their wicked audacity was maturely repressed, as well by the authority of the supreme magistracy, as by the prudence of the pastors, and the just censures of the church: that of Coolbasius, in the national Synod at Middleburg; that of Herbertus, in the Synods of South Holland; and that of Wiggerus, in the Synods of North Holland.

Afterwards James Arminius, pastor of the most celebrated church at Amsterdam, attempted the same thing, with great boldness and enterprize; a man indeed of a more vigorous genius, *(excitatioris,)* but whom nothing pleased except that which commended itself by some shew of novelty; so that he seemed to disdain most things received in the Reformed churches, even on that very account, that they had been *received.* He first paved the way for himself to this thing, by publickly and privately extenuating, and vehemently attacking *(sugillando)* the reputation and authority of the most Illustrious doctors of the reformed church, Calvin, Zanchius, Beza, Martyr, and others; that by the ruin of their name, he might raise a step to glory for himself. Afterwards he began openly to propose and disseminate various heterodox opinions, nearly related to the errors of the ancient Pelagians, especially in an explanation of the epistle to the Romans: but by the vigilance and authority of the venerable presbytery of that church, his attempts were speedily opposed, lest he should be able to cause those disturbances in the church, which he seemed to project *(moliri).* Yet he did not cease among his own friends, as well as among the pastors of other churches, John Utenbogardus, Adrian, Borrius, and others, whose friendship the same common studies had conciliated, to propagate his opinions, by what-

ever means he could; and to challenge Francis Junius, the most celebrated professor of sacred theology at Leyden, to a conference concerning the same.*

But when in the second year of this age, (Aug. 28. 1602.) that most renowned man D. Junius had been snatched away from the University of Leyden, with the greatest sorrow of the Belgick churches, Utenbogardus, who then favoured the opinion of Arminius, with great earnestness commended him to the most noble and ample the Curators of the University of Leyden, that he indeed might be appointed in the place of D. Junius in the professorship of sacred theology in that University. When the deputies of the churches understood this, fearing lest the vocation of a man so very much suspected of heterodoxy, might sometime give cause of contentions and schisms in the churches; they intreated the most noble lords the Curators, that they would not expose the churches to those perils, but rather would think of appointing another proper person, who was free from this suspicion. And they also admonished Utenbogardus to desist from this recommendation; who, despising these admonitions, did not desist from urging his (Arminius's) vocation, until at length he had attained the same.

His vocation having been thus appointed, the presbytery of Amsterdam refused to consent to his dismission; especially for this reason, because the more prudent thought, that a disposition so greatly luxuriant, and prone to innovation, would be statedly employed, with more evident danger in an University, at which youth consecrated to the ministry of the churches are educated, and where greater liberty of teaching uses to be taken, than in any particular church in

* 'The lustre and authority of the college of Geneva began gradually to decline, from the time that the United Provinces, being formed into a free and independent republic, Universities were founded at Leyden, Franeker, and Utrecht.' Mosheim, vol. v. p. 365.

which it may be restrained within bounds, by the vigilance and authority of the presbytery. His dismission was notwithstanding obtained, by the frequent petitions of the lords the Curators, of Utenbogardus, and even of Arminius himself; yet upon this condition, that a conference having been first held with Dr. Francis Gomarus, concerning the principal heads of doctrine, he should remove from himself all suspicion of heterodoxy, by an explicit *(rotunda)* declaration of his opinion; when he had first promised, with a solemn attestation, that he would never disseminate his opinions, if perhaps he had any singular ones.* This conference was held before the lords the Curators, the deputies of the Synod also being present; in which, when he (Arminius) professed, that he unreservedly *(diserte)* condemned the principal dogmas of the Pelagians concerning natural grace; the powers of free will, original sin, the perfection of man in this life, predestination, and the others; that he approved all things, which Augustine and the other fathers had written against the Pelagians; and moreover, that he judged the Pelagian errors had been rightly refuted and condemned by the fathers; and at the same time promised, that he would teach nothing which differed from the *received doctrine* of the churches, he was admitted to the professorship of theology.†

May 6, 7. 1602.] In the beginning of this, he endeavoured by every means to avert from himself every suspicion of heterodoxy; so that he defended by his support

* How far he fulfilled this solemn promise and attestation, not only the following history, but even the histories of his most decided advocates, fully show. In fact, he fulfilled it in the very same manner, that the subscriptions and most solemn engagements of numbers in our church at their ordination are fulfilled.

† The *received doctrine of the churches* was contained in the Belgick Confession and Catechism. Let the reader carefully attend to this, and bear it in mind while he peruses the subsequent narrative.

and patronage in publick disputations, [October 28.] the doctrine of the reformed churches, concerning the satisfaction of Christ, justifying faith, justification by faith, the perseverance of those who truly believe, the certitude of salvation, the imperfection of man in this life, and the other heads of doctrine, which he afterwards contradicted, and which at this day are opposed by his disciples. (This he did) contrary to his own opinion, as John Arnoldi Corvinus, in a certain Dutch writing ingenuously confesses.

But when he had been now engaged in this employment as professor, a year or two, it was detected, that he publickly and privately attacked (*sugillare*) most of the dogmas received in the reformed churches, called them into doubt, and rendered them suspected to his scholars: and that he enervated the principal arguments, by which they used to be maintained from the word of God, by the same exceptions, which the Jesuits, the Socinians, and other enemies of the reformed church were accustomed to employ:* that he gave some of his own manuscript tracts privately to his scholars to be transcribed, in which he had comprised his own opinion: that he recommended in an especial manner to his scholars, the writings of Castalio, Cornhertius, Suerezius, and of men like them: and that he spake contemptuously of Calvin, Beza, Martyr, Zanchius, Ursinus, and of other eminent doctors of the reformed churches.† He moreover openly professed, that he had very many consi-

* The reformed church included, not only the church of Geneva, but the churches in Switzerland, France, Holland, England and Scotland, and others. The doctrines opposed were then not those of Calvin or of Geneva in particular, but common to all these churches.

† This is the only way, in which Calvin is ever mentioned in the whole of this history, as along with many others, an eminent doctor of the reformed churches; for it was not then supposed, that there was any essential difference between the doctrine of the church at Geneva, and that of the other reformed churches.

derations or animadversions, against the received doctrine, which he would lay open in his own time. Some pastors, who were intimately acquainted with him, gloried, that they possessed an entirely new theology. His scholars, having returned home from the University, or having been removed to other Universities, petulantly *(proterve)* insulted the reformed churches, by disputing, contradicting, and reviling their doctrine.

When the churches of Holland considered these and other things, being justly solicitous, lest the purity of the reformed doctrine having been weakened, *(or corrupted, labefactata,)* and the youth which was educated in this seminary, for the hope of the churches, imbued with depraved opinions, this matter should at length burst forth to the great mischief and disturbance of the churches: they judged that an enquiry should be throughly made into the whole transaction, by their own deputies, to whom the common care of the churches used to be committed; so that in the next Synods it might be maturely looked to, that the church might not suffer any detriment. Concerning this cause the deputies of the churches, as well of South, as of North Holland, go to Arminius, and state to him, the rumours which were every where circulated concerning him and his doctrine, and how great solicitude possessed all the churches; and, in a friendly manner, they request him, that if perhaps he found a want of any thing in the received doctrine, he would sincerely *(sincerè, ingenuously)* open it to his brethren; in order, either that satisfaction might be given him by a friendly conference, or the whole affair might be carried before a lawful Synod. To these (persons) he answered, That he himself had never given just cause for these rumours; neither did it appear prudent in him to institute any conference with the same persons, as deputies, who would make the report concerning the matter unto the

Synod: but if they would lay aside this character, *(personam,)* he would not decline to confer with them, as with private pastors, concerning his doctrine; on this condition, that if perhaps they should too little agree among themselves, they would report nothing of this to the Synod. As the deputies judged this to be unjust, and as the solicitude could not be taken away from the churches by a conference of this kind, they departed from him without accomplishing their purpose *(re infecta.)* Nor did they yet the less understand, from the other professors of sacred theology, that various questions were eagerly agitated among the students of theology concerning predestination, free will, the perseverance of the saints, and other heads of doctrine, such as before the coming of Arminius had not been agitated among them.

July 26. 1605.] He was also admonished by the church of Leyden, of which he was a member, by the most ample and most celebrated men, Phædo Brouchovius, the consul of the city of Leyden, and Paulus Merula, professor of history (*historiarum*, *histories*, *ancient* and *modern*,) elders of the same church, that he would hold a friendly conference with his colleagues, before the presbytery of the church of Leyden, concerning those things which he disapproved in the received doctrine; from which it might be ascertained, whether, or in what dogmas, he agreed, or disagreed, with the rest of the pastors. To these (persons) he replied, That he could not do that without the leave of the Curators of the University; neither could he see what advantage would redound to the church from such a conference.

The time approached when the annual Synods of the churches in each Holland used to be held; and when, according to the custom, the grievances *(gravamina)* of the church were sent from each of the Classes: and among the rest this also was transmitted by the Class of Dordrecht.

'Inasmuch as rumours are heard, that certain controversies 'concerning the doctrine of the reformed churches, have 'arisen in the University and church of Leyden; the Class 'hath judged it to be necessary, that the Synod should de-'liberate on the means, by which these controversies may 'most advantageously and speedily be settled; that all 'schisms, and stumbling-blocks, which might thence arise, 'may be removed in time, and the union of the reformed 'churches be preserved against the calumnies of the ad-'versaries.'—Arminius bore this very grievously, (*ægerrime,*) and strove with all his power, that this grievance should be recalled; which when he could not obtain, by the assistance of the Curators of the University, he procured a testimonial from his colleagues, in which it was declared, 'That indeed 'more things were disputed among the students, than it was 'agreeable to them; but that among the professors of sacred 'theology themselves, as far as it appeared to them, there 'was no dissention in fundamentals.'

A short time after the Synod of the province of South Holland was convened, in the city of Rotterdam, which when it had understood from the class of Dort, the many and weighty reasons, for which this grievance had been transmitted by the same, and at the same time also from the deputies of the Synod, how things really were in the University of Leyden, and what had been done by Arminius and the other professors of sacred theology; after mature deliberation it determined, that this spreading evil must be counteracted in time, neither ought the remedy of it to be procrastinated, under the uncertain hope of a national synod. And, accordingly, it enjoined on the deputies of the Synod, that they should most diligently enquire, concerning articles on which disputations were principally held among the students of theology in the University of Leyden; and should petition the lords the Curators, that a mandate might

be given to the professors of sacred theology, to declare openly and explicitly their opinion concerning the same: in order, that by this means it might be ascertained respecting their agreement or disagreement; and the churches, if perhaps there was no dissention, or no grievous one, might be freed from solicitude: or, if some more weighty one should be detected, they might think maturely concerning a remedy of the same.

The Synod also commanded all the pastors, for the sake of testifying their consent in doctrine, that they should subscribe the Confession and Catechism of these churches; which, in many classes had been neglected, and by others refused.* The deputies of the Synod, having diligently examined the matter, exhibited to the lords the curators nine questions, concerning which they had understood, that at this time disputations were principally maintained: and they requested, that it might be enjoined by their authority on the professors of sacred theology, to explain fully their opinion concerning the same. But they answered, That some hope now shone forth of obtaining a national Synod in a short time; and therefore they judged it more prudent *(consultius)*

* 'The opinions of Calvin, concerning *the decrees of God*, and divine 'grace, became daily more general, and were gradually introduced every 'where into the schools of learning. There was not, however, any 'public law, or *confession of faith*, that obliged the pastors of the re-'formed churches in any part of the world, to conform their sentiments 'to the theological doctrines that were adopted and taught at Geneva.' **Mosheim**, *vol.* v. p. 366. This introduces the learned historian's account of the Synod of Dort: but the Confession and Catechism of the Belgick churches alone were appealed to in this contest, and they were certainly obligatory on all the pastors of those churches, and subscribed to by most of them. Again: 'Arminius knew, that the Dutch divines, 'were neither obliged by their confession of faith, nor by any other 'public law, to adopt and propagate the opinions of Calvin.' Vol. v. p. 41. Now Arminius was not accused, as the whole history shews, of deviating from the opinions of Calvin, but for openly opposing the Confession and Catechism of the Belgick Churches.

to reserve these questions to the same, than by any further inquisition respecting them to give a handle to dissention. The pastors also, who had embraced the opinion of Arminius, every where in the Classes refused to obey the mandate of the Synod, concerning the subscription of the Confession and the Catechism.

This matter increased the solicitude of the churches, when they saw that these pastors, relying on the favour of certain persons, evidently despised the authority of the Synod, and more boldly *(audacius)* persisted in their attempt. Wherefore, as in that way a remedy could not be applied to this evil, they copiously explained to the most illustrious and mighty lords the States General, in how great a danger the church was placed; and petitioned, that in order to the taking away of these evils, a national Synod, which had now been for many years deferred, might be called together, by the authority of the same persons, at the earliest opportunity. These (the States General) declared, that the states of all the provinces had already agreed on the convocation of a national Synod; but that there were those among them, who, in the letters of consent, had added this condition, or, as they called it, *clause:* Namely, that in the same there should be a revision of the Confession and Catechism of these churches; and, consequently, the convocation of a national Synod could not be made, unless this clause were added, without the detriment *(præjudicio)* of the States of that province. But, as it was not obscurely evident, who for some years had counselled *(authores fuissent)* the Illustrious the States of Holland, that this clause should be added, and even pressed; and as it might be feared, if should be annexed to the calling of the Synod, that they who earnestly desired changes of doctrine, would abuse the same; and at the same time also, lest, (especially in this state of things,) it should afford no light cause of

offence to the churches; as if the Illustrious States themselves, or our churches, doubted of the truth of the doctrine comprised in this Confession and Catechism; the deputies of the churches petitioned that the convocation of the Synod should be drawn up in general terms, as they call them, in the manner hitherto customary: especially, as this clause seemed the less necessary; seeing that in national Synods it had always been permitted, if any one thought that he had ought against any article of these writings, fairly and duly to propose it.

But the Illustrious lords the States General declared, that this clause was not so to be understood, as if they desired any thing to be changed by it, in the doctrine of these churches; for indeed a doctrine was not always changed by a revisal, (or recognition, *recognitione,)* but sometimes was even confirmed; yet it could not be omitted without the prejudice of that province, which had expressly added it. They therefore delivered the letters of consent, in which this also had been added, to the deputies of the churches, which they transmitted to the churches of each of the provinces; and with them they also signified, what pains they had bestowed that it might be omitted.

March 15, 1606.] The Belgick churches, on the receipt of these letters, rejoiced indeed, that after the expectation of so many years, at length the power of holding a national Synod had been obtained; though they were not a little stumbled by this clause. Not because they were unwilling, that the Confession and the Catechism should be recognized, after the accustomed and due manner, in the national Synod: but because they feared, lest they, who were labouring for a change of doctrine, should be rendered more daring, as if by this clause, a power was granted to them, by the publick authority of the lords the States, of moving and innovating whatever any one pleased; and that these discords and con-

troversies had arisen from them, not from the inordinate desire of innovating, but from an earnest endeavour of satisfying the decrees of the Illustrious the States. In the same letters, the Illustrious lords the States General gave information, that it had been determined by them, to call together some learned and peaceful theologians, from each of the provinces, that they might deliberate with the same, concerning the time, place, and manner of holding this national Synod.

August 1606.] While these things were transacting, the Annual Synod of the churches of Holland was held at Gorinchem; in which, when the deputies of the churches had related, what had been done by them in the cause of the National Synod, and what had been determined by the Illustrious lords the States General, it was judged proper to enjoin on the same (deputies) diligently to press the convocation of a National Synod; and, though the Synod thought, that the Confession and Catechism, would be recognized, in a way and manner, new and unaccustomed hitherto, in the national Synod, it purposed, that those persons, who should be called together by the States of Holland, out of South Holland, to the convention, in which (it was to be deliberated) concerning the time, place, and manner of holding the national Synod, should be admonished to petition from the States General, in the name of these churches; that the clause, of which it hath before been spoken, might be omitted in the letters of convocation, for the reasons before assigned; and that, in the place of it, other milder words, which might produce less offence, might be substituted.

It was also enjoined in the same Synod, to all the pastors of the churches of South Holland, and to all the professors of sacred theology in the University of Leyden, that, at as early a time as could be, they should exhibit the

considerations or animadversions, which they had, upon the doctrine contained in the Confession and Catechism; (because Arminius and the pastors who were attached to him were often accustomed to glory, that they had very many;) the pastors indeed in their own Classes, but the professors to the deputies of the churches; that the same might be lawfully carried unto the national Synod, if satisfaction could not be given to them in the Classes. When this was demanded of the pastors attached to Arminius, they declined proposing them in the Classes; because, they said, they were not yet prepared: but that they would propose them in their own time and manner. Arminius also, having been admonished concerning this thing by the deputies of the churches, answered, that it could not be done at that time with edification; but that, in the national Synod, he would fully lay open the same.

May 23, 1607.] And when not long after, the Illustrious the States General called together some theologians out of each of the provinces, with whom they might deliberate, respecting the time, place, and manner of the national Synod: namely, John Leo, and John Fontanus, from Geldria; Francis Gomarus, James Arminius, John Utenbogardus, and John Becius, out of South Holland; Herman, Frankelius, and Henry Brandius, out of Zealand; Everard Botius, and Henry Johannis, out of the province of Utrecht; Sibrander Lubertus, and Jannes Bogermannus, out of Friesland; Thomas Goswinius, out of Transisulania; John Acronus, and John Nicasias, out of the city Groningen and Omlandii; the questions, concerning which it should be deliberated in this convention, were proposed to them by the Illustrious the States General; and it was declared, by their concurrent suffrages, that as to the time, it was necessary that the Synod should be called together as soon as might be, in the beginning of the ensuing summer. [A. D. 1608.] That, as

to place, the city Utrecht would be the most convenient for holding the Synod: as to the manner, 1. That the grievances to be discussed in the Synod, should be brought before the national Synod, from each of the provincial Synods: 2. That from each of the several Synods, and by the suffrages of the same, four pastors and two elders should be deputed; in the place of which elders also, men of singular condition, and skill in matters of theology, and adorned by a testimony of piety, though they did not fill up any ecclesiastical office, might be deputed: 3. That to these deputies, power should be given in all things, which should be treated of in the Synod, not of deliberating only, but also of determining and deciding: 4. That the rule of judgment, in all the controversies, relating to doctrine and morals, should be the written word of God, or the sacred scriptures, alone:* 5. That to the national Synod, should be called together, not only the churches which are in Federated Belgium, namely, of each language, the Dutch and French; but those also of the Belgick nation, which are dispersed without Belgium; whether they were collected under the

* This rule completely excluded all human reasoning, authority, tradition, or new revelations, as opposed to the written word, "the sure "testimony" of God: not only the authority of fathers and councils, with the traditions of the church of Rome; but the authority also of the church of Geneva, of Calvin, and of all other reformed teachers. How is it then, that ecclesiastical historians generally represent this contest, as an attempt to impose the doctrine of the church of Geneva on the Belgick churches? It might as reasonably be said, that the clergymen and others, who combined and used every effort, some years since, to procure the abolishment of subscription to the articles of the church of England, but could not succeed, had the doctrines of Calvin and Geneva imposed on them. Whatever similarity there might be, between the doctrine of Calvin or that of the church of Geneva, and the Confession and Catechism of the Belgick churches; the latter was exclusively appealed to by the other pastors, and avowedly opposed by Arminius and his followers: yet even these were to be revised according to the written word of God.

cross, or otherwise: (*alibi:*) 6. That the Illustrious and most mighty, the States General, should be requested, that they would deign to send to the same their own delegates, professing the reformed religion, that, in their name, they might preside over the order of it: 7. That the professors also of sacred theology should be called to the same.

In these things indeed they were all agreed; as in some others they could not agree among themselves. For Arminius and Utenbogardus, and the two (deputies) from Utrecht, whom they had drawn over to their opinion, determined these three things: 1. That that was to be held as the decision of the Synod, not which had been determined by the votes of all the deputies to the Synod, but also by those who deputed them: for, under the name of the Synod, not the deputies alone, but those who deputed them also, ought to be understood: 2. That it should always be free to the deputies, as often as they might choose, and as they perceived that they were burdened in any thing, to retire to their own (friends or constituents) for the sake of taking counsel: 3. That the revision of the Belgick Confession and Catechism was altogether necessary; so that they saw no cause, for which the clause concerning the revision of those writings, should not be inserted in the letters of convocation.

The rest of the pastors and professors judged: 1. That that should be considered as the definitive decision of the Synod, which had been determined either by the concurrent votes of the deputies to the Synod, or of the majority of them; but that, under the name of the Synod, those were to be accounted, who, as lawful deputies to the same, had met together with the power of judging: 2. That it might indeed be allowed them to retire to their friends for the sake of taking counsel; yet so, that under this pretext, the proceedings of the Synod should not be rashly disturbed:

that when, and in what manner, and for what causes, they might thus recede, should not be left to the unrestricted will *(arbitrio)* of individuals, but to the judgment of the whole Synod: 3. That the Belgick Confession and Catechism might indeed be revised in the Synod; if, for adequate causes, the Synod should determine that this was necessary; and likewise that it should be free to all, who thought that they had any thing against those writings, to propose the same to the Synod in due manner, to be examined and decided on: but, because the clause concerning the revision, if it should be inserted in the letters of convocation, seemed likely to give to some cause of offence, and to others the licence of innovating; they thought that the Illustrious the States General should be petitioned, that this clause, for the sake of the tranquillity of the churches, might be omitted in the letters of convocation; and that, in the place of it, these, or similar words might be substituted; namely, That the Synod was convened, for the confirmation, agreement, and propagation of pure and orthodox doctrine; for preserving and establishing the peace and good order (εὐταξίαν) of the church; and finally, for promoting true piety among the inhabitants of these regions. And most of them shewed, that they had this very thing in the mandates from their own churches, and also from the States themselves of their own provinces. This disagreement of counsels and judgments threw in a new delay to the national Synod: for they, who had hitherto resisted its convocation, eagerly seizing on this occasion, laboured earnestly by all means, that the convocation of the Synod, though now promised, might be hindered.

In this convention Arminius was requested, with the strongest obtestation, by the other professors and pastors, that, the things which he had (to alledge) against the doctrine expressed in the Confession and Catechism, those

he would in a free and brotherly manner communicate to them, as his fellow ministers: the promise being added, that they would bestow pains fully to satisfy him; or that he, on honourable conditions, might be reconciled to his colleagues, and might thenceforth live peaceably with them; neither would they, a reconciliation having been effected, publish beyond the place of the convention, any of those things, which he should make manifest unto them. But he said, that neither was this thought prudent by him, nor was he bound to do it, as the convention was not appointed for this purpose. In the following summer, when the annual Synod of the South Holland churches was held at Delph, Utenbogardus was admonished, to explain to the Synod, the reasons, on account of which, in giving the counsels concerning the manner of holding the national Synod, he, with Arminius, had thought and advised differently from the rest of the pastors; that the same might be well considered and decided on by the Synod. He answered, That he was bound to render an account of this to the Illustrious the States alone, and not to the Synod. Being requested, that he would explain those things, which he had (to alledge) against the doctrine that was contained in the Confession and Catechism of these churches: he replied, that neither did it appear to him prudent to do it in that assembly, nor was he prepared. It was in this Synod also enquired, whether, according to the decree of the former Synod, any considerations, or animadversions upon the Confession and Catechism had been exhibited to the classes: but it was answered by the delegates from each of the Classes, That most of the pastors had professed in the Classes, that they had no animadversions against the received doctrine; but that those, who professed that they had some, were unwilling to explain them: either because they said, that they were not yet prepared, or because they did not think that this

was advisable for them.* Wherefore the Synod judged, that it should again be enjoined on them, that, omitting all evasions, subterfuges, *(tergiversationibus,)* and delays, they should explain, as early as might be, all the animadversions which they had against the received doctrine; each of them to his own class.

It was likewise shewn to the Synod, that every where in the churches, dissentions daily more and more increased; and that most of the young men coming forth from the University of Leyden, and the instruction of Arminius, being called to the ministry of the churches, in the examination indeed concealed their opinion by ambiguous methods of speaking; but when they had been set forth to the ministry, they immediately moved new disputations, contended earnestly for opinions, and gloried that they had various considerations against the received doctrine: That in the classes and presbyteries, sharp dissentions and altercations arose, among the pastors, concerning most of the heads of doctrine; and that, among the people also, various disputings concerning doctrine were heard, with the great offence and disturbance of the churches: yea, moreover, that the beginnings of schisms were seen: that the pastors attached to Arminius instituted frequent meetings in which they might deliberate concerning the propagation of their doctrine; and that the people more and more went away into parties.†

* Nothing can be more evident than this fact, that the followers of Arminius aimed to subvert, or exceedingly to modify, the doctrine of the authorized writings of the Belgick churches; and that the others wanted no alteration to be made in that doctrine, as more favourable, either to the doctrine of the church of Geneva, or of Calvin, as many writers confidently assert.

† The enlightened and decided friend to free enquiry, will see even in the causes of these complaints, (while the *immediate* effects may perhaps be deemed very unfavourable to truth and holiness,) the dawn of that more enlarged state of things, in which free investigation of both received, and exploded, and novel opinions, proves ultimately

As therefore the Synod judged that the remedy of this evil could no longer be deferred, and that the hope of obtaining a national Synod, because of this diversity of counsels and opinions, was altogether uncertain: it was determined by the Synod, from the counsel of the most ample the delegates, to petition of the Illustrious lords the States of Holland and West Friesland; that from the two Synods of South and North Holland, one provincial Synod might be called at the first opportunity, (as it had formerly been done in similar difficulties,) in order to quiet and remove these evils. When the deputies of each Synod, had copiously explained to the Illustrious lords the States these difficulties of the churches, as growing more and more heavy; and had petitioned, that for the removal of the same the convocation of a provincial Synod might be appointed, at the most early time: though great hopes had been given them, by the most ample the lords the delegates, they were not as yet able to obtain it; because at that time [Sept. 14, 1607.] a beginning had been made of settling the terms of a truce with the enemy: and the Illustrious States being themselves fully occupied with the most weighty affairs of the Republick, could not have leisure to attend to these ecclesiastical concerns.

April 30, 1608.] In the mean time Arminius, when he saw that the churches were urgent, that this cause should be determined by the legal ecclesiastical judgments: in order that he might decline that trial, (*forum*, meaning the decision of the ecclesiastical courts,) having exhibited a

and highly beneficial to the cause of truth: and he will agree, that the arm of authority, secular or ecclesiastical, could not beneficially be exerted against it; except so far, as to require those, who voluntarily belong to, and minister in any church, to conform to the rules of that church, or to recede from it without further molestation. But this does not prevent the propriety of doing justice to the character of wise and pious men, to whom no views of this kind had as yet ever been presented.

suppliant writing *(libellum)* to the Illustrious the States, obtained that cognizance should be taken of his cause, by the most ample the counsellors of the supreme court, being *political* men; (not *ecclesiastical*;) and Gomarus was commanded to hold a conference with Arminius before the same, the pastors being present, who had lately attended at the preparatory convention from South and North Holland. When the deputies of the churches had understood this, they again requested the Illustrious the States of Holland and West Friesland, that, instead of this conference instituted before the supreme court, a provincial Synod might be called; that in the same, cognizance might be taken and judgment given on this ecclesiastical cause, by ecclesiastical men, skilful in these matters, and lawfully delegated by the churches with the power of awarding judgment. The Illustrious the States answered, that the cognizance of the cause alone had been entrusted to the supreme court; but that the *decision* of it would afterwards be committed, either to a provincial or to a national Synod.

In this conference, a long dispute occurred about the order of proceeding. Arminius contended, that Gomarus ought to undertake the part of an *agent*, (*actoris*, pleader, or prosecutor, or accuser,) but that he was only bound to defend himself: while Gomarus judged, that this method of proceeding was not less unjust than unusual, especially in an ecclesiastical cause, before political judges: that he indeed was prepared to bring proof before a lawful Synod; that Arminius had proposed dogmas which were at variance with the word of God, and with the Confession and Catechism of the Belgick churches; but that it could not be done in this place, without prejudice to his cause: that he (Gomarus) thought this conference, in order to answer the intention of the Illustrious lords the States, might better be conducted in this manner; namely, that without these

mutual accusations, each of them should clearly and perspicuously explain and set forth his own opinion, concerning every one of the heads of doctrine; for thence it might most advantageously be understood, in what things they agreed or disagreed. As to what belonged to himself, he would not shrink from explaining his opinion concerning all the heads of doctrine fully and openly, as much so indeed as could be desired by any one; that Arminius also, if he were willing fully to perform the part of a faithful teacher, ought in the same manner to declare his own opinion, and not any longer in this business to use subterfuges of this kind. He, (Arminius,) nevertheless persisted in his purpose; so that he at length exclaimed, that he wondered, seeing various rumours of his heterodoxy had gone about through the churches; and the conflagration excited by him, was said to rise above the very roofs of the churches; that he yet found no one, who dared to lodge an accusation against him. Gomarus, in order to meet this boasting, undertook to prove that he had taught such an opinion concerning the first article of our faith, namely, concerning the justification of man before God, as was opposed to the word of God, and to the confession of the Belgick churches. For the proof of this thing, he produced his own very words, written out from the hand writing of the same Arminius, in which he asserts, that in the justification of man before God, the righteousness of Christ is not imputed for righteousness; but that faith itself, or the act of believing (τὸ *credere*,) by the gracious acceptation *(acceptationem, acquittal)* was that our righteousness, by which we are justified before God. When Arminius saw himself thus fast bound, as he could not indeed deny this to be evidence of proof, *(evidentiam probationis, conclusive evidence,)* he began to consent to another method of proceeding; namely, that each should sign in a writing his own opinion, comprised in

certain theses, concerning the principal articles, in which the difference was thought to consist; on which each afterwards in return marked his own animadversions.

This conference having been terminated, the counsellors of the supreme court reported to the Illustrious the states of Holland and West Friesland, that they, as far as they had been able to perceive from the conference, judged; that the controversies, which had arisen between these two professors, were not of so great importance, but regarded especially some more subtile disputes concerning Predestination, which might either be omitted or connived at, *(dissimulari,)* by a mutual toleration. But Gomarus added, that the difference detected in the opinions were of so great moment, that he, with the opinion of Arminius, should not dare to appear before the judgment of God: and, unless a remedy were maturely applied, it was to be feared, lest in a short time, one province should be engaged in contest against another, church against church, state against state, and citizens against each other. But the Illustrious the States determined, that the writings sealed on each side in this conference, should be preserved in the supreme court, even unto a national Synod, neither should they be communicated in the mean while to any man *(cuiquam mortalium)*. Yet, neither did this conference deliver from anxiety the churches, but rather increased it; especially as the things which had been done at it were concealed from the churches. For not without reason they judged, *(haud temerè,)* that this was done in favour of Arminius, lest his opinions should be made manifest. In the mean while the churches did not cease, by their deputies, strenuously to petition the Illustrious States, that this ecclesiastical cause, which, except with great danger of the church, could not be deferred, might be examined and decided on, as soon as possible, by the judgment either of a lawful provincial, or a national

Synod. When Arminius understood this, he procured by Utenbogardus, whose authority at that time was great among most of the chief persons of the country, that the Illustrious States should command, that the Annual Synods themselves, as well of South as of North Holland, the time of which was at hand, should be deferred. But as this could not be done without the greatest detriment of the churches, they again, having explained before the Illustrious the States their difficulties, petitioned, either that it might be allowed, to hold, according to custom, each of the annual Synods, as well that in South, as in North Holland; or that out of each united together one provincial Synod should as soon as possible be called, as it had also before this been petitioned.

June 28, *1608.*] To this petition, the Illustrious States declared, that they had determined, in the next October to call together a provincial Synod for this purpose. When this had been made known to the churches, all the pastors attached to Arminius were again admonished, that each of them would lay open to his Class, his considerations, (or remarks, *considerationes*,) that the same might be lawfully carried to the approaching Synod. But they, as before, so now also each of them, declined this with one consent, with their accustomed evasions *(tergiversationibus)*. And when the month of October approached, and the churches pressed the convocation of a provincial Synod, as promised, that was again deferred for two months: and it was again permitted to the churches, to hold the particular annual Synods, as well in South as in North Holland; yet on this condition, that the cause of Arminius should not be treated of in the same, which they willed to be reserved to the Provincial Synod. In the Synod of the churches of South Holland, which was held at Dordrecht (or Dort), when it had been reported, that all the pastors attached to Arminius were hitherto unwilling to lay open their considerations,

which they said they had against the received doctrine, to their fellow pastors, *(symmistis,)* but that they eluded by various evasions, the admonitions of the churches, and the decrees of the Synods; it was determined, that it should be gravely enjoined on them, to lay open these their considerations, within the space of the next month, after the admonition given, under the penalty of incurring the ecclesiastical censure against the contumacious. The same also was demanded from the professors of sacred theology in the University of Leyden, and from Peter Bertius, the ruler of the theological college. These pastors, when they saw, that either their opinion must be laid open, or they must undergo the ecclesiastical censure; in order to evade each of these, they, by the aid of Utenbogardus, obtained letters, from the Illustrious lords the States, in which it was enjoined on these pastors, that within the space of one month, they should transmit to the lords the States themselves, the considerations which they had, sealed up, that they might be reserved by the same, to be exhibited to the provincial Synod. The professors, being asked by the deputies of the Synod, if they had any considerations of this kind, to open these before them, Gomarus answered; indeed, that he had observed nothing in the Confession and Catechism of the churches, which he thought in need of correction or alteration, as too little agreeing with the word of God; but Arminius, that he would answer by writing to this demand, in his own time. And when he saw himself thus urged by the churches to the declaration of his opinion, he explained in a prolix discourse to the lords the States, in their stated convention, what he thought concerning divine predestination, the grace of God, and the free-will of man, the perseverance of the saints, the assurance of salvation, the perfection of man in this life, the Deity of the Son of God, the justification of man before God, and the other heads of doctrine.

At the same time, he endeavoured to persuade the Illustrious the States, that, in these reformed churches, a doctrine was delivered concerning the divine predestination, which was at variance *(pugnaret)* with the nature of God, with his wisdom, justice, and goodness; with the nature of man and his free-will; with the work of the creation; with the nature of life and death eternal, and finally with that of sin; and which took away the divine grace, was inimical to the glory of God, and pernicious to the salvation of men; which made God the author of sin, hindered sorrow for sin, took away all pious solicitude, lessened the earnest desire of doing good things, extinguished the ardour of prayer, took away the "fear and trembling," with which we ought to "work out "our own salvation," made way for desperation, subverted the Gospel, hindered the ministry of the word, and lastly, overturned the foundations, not only of the Christian religion, but also wholly of all religion.*

When Gomarus had heard these things, he deemed it

* It is probable, that in all the volumes, which ever since that time, have been written by Arminians, or Anti-calvinists, in Refutation of Calvinism, there is no objection of any plausibility, urged against the doctrines designated by that term, which is not here briefly, and fairly, and emphatically stated, as used by Arminius, before the States of Holland, in this history, written with the express purpose of sanctioning the decisions of the Synod of Dort: perhaps, no where else can so compendious a list of these objections be found. The compilers evidently did not consider them as unanswerable, or very formidable; nor were they afraid of having the whole cause fairly tried and determined according to THE WORD OF GOD; the objections being indeed, neither more nor less, than man's presumptuous reasonings against the express, sure, and authoritative testimony of God himself; the substance of the enquiry which the apostle answered, or silenced at once, "Thou wilt say to me, Why doth he yet find fault? "for who hath resisted his will? Nay but, O man," rejoins the apostle, "Who art thou that repliest against God?" It is evident from the whole narrative, that the Confession and Catechism of the Belgick churches, as well as the sermons and writings of the pastors, were involved in this heavy charge, and condemned most deeply by this sweeping sentence.

a part of his duty, to give better information (*melius erudire*) to the Illustrious lords the States, lest perhaps by this method, their minds should be pre-occupied with unfavourable prejudices against the orthodox doctrine. Having therefore petitioned for permission to speak, he, in the same convention, copiously (*prolixe*) explained what was the genuine opinion of Arminius concerning the grace of God and the free-will of man, the justification of man before God, the perfection of man in this life, predestination, the origin of sin, and the perseverance of the saints: and what just causes of suspicion, he (Arminius) had given, that he did not think aright, concerning the Holy Scripture, the sacred Trinity, the providence of God, the satisfaction of Jesus Christ, the church, faith, good works, and the other heads of doctrine. By what arts also he disseminated his own opinions; namely, that when publickly asked and solemnly enjoined, he hath hitherto concealed his opinion from the churches; but had diligently inculcated it privately on the pastors, whom he hoped he should be able to draw over into it, and on his own pupils (or scholars); that he enervated the principal arguments of our party, (*nostrorum*,) with which the orthodox doctrine used to be fortified; but confirmed those of the Jesuits, and of the other adversaries, with which they are accustomed to fight against the doctrine of the reformed churches; that he suggested various doubts concerning the truth of the received doctrine, into the minds of the pupils; and (taught them) to hold the same at first, as in an equilibrium with the heterodox doctrine, and at length altogether to reject it: that hitherto he had not been willing to publish any declaration of sincerity and consent in doctrine, though very often lovingly, and in a brotherly manner, asked by the churches to do it: that he had earnestly laboured by all means, that he might not lay open to the churches his errors, which had been detected

before the supreme court: and that he had aimed at this one thing, by delaying the time, to have the opportunity, of drawing over the more persons into his own opinion, and of every where occupying the churches: that, having despised the decisions and decrees of Synods, Classes, and Presbyteries, he had in the first instance burst forth (*prosiliisse*) to the tribunal of the Supreme Magistrate, and had there proposed his complaints and accusations against the doctrine of the churches; and by the arts of a courtier (*aulicas*) had industriously studied to conciliate favour to himself, but to bring hatred on the churches. Wherefore he (Gomarus) earnestly intreated the States, (seeing that the students of sacred theology in the University of Leyden, and every where the pastors, daily more and more revolted from the orthodox doctrine, discords and contentions spread abroad, the churches were disturbed, and the citizens were drawn into parties,) that the promised national Synod might as early as possible be called; in which, the causes of these evils having been legally examined, a suitable remedy might at length be applied. The deputies of the churches also soon after petitioned for the same: but by the endeavours of Utenbogardus and others it was effected, that this calling of the Synod should always be deferred.

April 4, 1609.] They (the deputies of the churches) likewise several times admonished Arminius, to send to them the considerations contained in the writing which he had promised; who at length answered by letter, that he did not deny that this had been promised by him, but, because he had understood that the Illustrious the States had ordered the pastors to send their considerations sealed up unto them, he had changed his mind, (*consilium,*) and that he would wait till the same also should be enjoined on him. Peter Bertius, the regent of the theological college, being admonished by the same deputies, that if he had any thing

against the received doctrine of the churches, he would freely explain it, declared his own opinion concerning most of the heads of doctrine openly without any evasion; and shewed that, in the articles of the justification of man before God, of predestination, of the grace of God, of free-will, and finally, of the perseverance of true believers, (*vere fidelium*,) he thought differently from the doctrine of the Belgick churches.* This rendered the churches more and more anxious; seeing they understood that not only Arminius in the University, but Bertius also, in the seminary of the churches of Holland, set before the youth entrusted to his fidelity, and destined to the ministry of the churches, heterodox doctrine; and, having drawn them aside from the sincerity (or *purity*) of the doctrine, instilled into them (*imbuere*) new opinions. The churches saw these things, and grieved; yet they were not able to apply the lawful remedy to these evils, though it was that which they chiefly wished and judged necessary; Utenbogardus, and others, whose authority was at that time great among certain chief persons of the country, hindering with all their power, by their means, all synodical conventions and ecclesiastical judgments.

Hence the pastors attached to Arminius were made more bold to propose their own heterodox opinions; and they began even publickly before the people, to defame the re-

* 'There was not, however, any public law, or *confession of faith*, 'that obliged the pastors of the reformed churches in any part of the 'world, to conform their sentiments to the theological doctrines that 'were adopted and taught at Geneva.' Mosheim, vol. v. p. 366. 'Ar-'minius knew, that the Dutch divines and doctors, were not obliged 'by their confession of faith, nor by any public law, to adopt and 'propagate the principles of Calvin.' Ibid. p. 441. It might be supposed from this, that the opposers of Arminius, and all concerned in procuring the Synod of Dort, wanted Arminius and his party to adhere to the Geneva Confession and the creed of Calvin, &c: whereas in fact, these are never mentioned in the history prefixed to that of the Synod, but the received doctrine of the Belgick churches alone.

ceived doctrine with various calumnies, and to rage furiously (*debacchari*) against it, as horrid and detestable. Among these, a certain person, (called) Adolphus Venator, the pastor of the church of Alcmar in North Holland, was not the last; who, besides that he was of too little approved a life, (*vitæ minus probatæ*,) openly and by no means in a dissembling manner, scattered abroad Pelagian and Socinian errors, with incredible impudence, publickly and privately: for which cause, he was suspended from the office of teaching, by the legitimate judgment of the churches of North Holland. He (however) despising the judgment of the churches, persisted in the office of teaching, against the will of the churches. The orthodox pastors in the Class of Alcmar judged that this unholy man, (*impurum*,) having been lawfully suspended from the ministry, and a few other pastors whom he had drawn over into his opinion, and who pertinaciously refused to testify their consent to the doctrine of the reformed churches, by the subscription of the Confession, should not be admitted into their assembly. They, having complained of this matter to the Illustrious the States, by the aid of Utenbogardus, obtained a mandate, by which this admission for them was commanded; which when the orthodox could not do, because of their conscience; they submissively requested the Illustrious the States, that they might not be burdened by mandates of this kind, which they could not conscientiously obey. The deputies of the churches, when they saw that these dissentions and scandals were daily more and more increased, again earnestly intreated (or adjured, *obtestati sunt*) the Illustrious the States, in the name of the churches, that the promised provincial Synod might be called together at the earliest time, for the removal of these evils. But when Utenbogardus, and the rest of the pastors addicted to Arminius, observed the minds of the Illustrious lords the States to incline to this; in order that

they might avoid the ecclesiastical decisions, they effected by certain individuals who seemed more attached to their cause, that, in the stead of the provincial Synod, a conference, concerning the controverted articles between Gomarus and Arminius, should be held, in the convention itself of the Illustrious States; in the which each might take to himself four pastors, whose counsels they might be allowed to use. Arminius had taken Jannes Utenbogardus, of Hague, Adrian Borrius of Leyden, Nicholas Grevinchovius of Rotterdam, and the before mentioned Adolphus Venator of the Alcmarian church. But Gomarus, (took) Ricardus Acronius of Scheidam, James Roland of Amsterdam, John Bogardus of Harlem, and Festus Hommius of Leyden, pastors of the church.

When they had come together, Gomarus and the pastors, who had joined themselves to him, requested these two things: 1. That this conference should be instituted in writing to be exhibited on each side; by which means, vain rumours of whatever kind might be counteracted. 2. That these writings should afterwards be delivered to a national Synod, to be examined and judged, by which the judgment of an ecclesiastical cause, might be reserved entire to the churches.* The Illustrious the States, willed that the conference should be instituted, by word of mouth, (*viva voce*,) yet so that it might be allowed to use writing in aid of the memory; and they promised, having given publick letters for confirmation of the matter, that this cause, when they

* That this cause might be regularly condemned, it was judged 'proper to bring it before an ecclesiastical assembly or Synod. This 'method of proceeding, was agreeable to the sentiments and principles 'of the Calvinists, who are of opinion, that all spiritual concerns and 'religious controversies ought to be judged and decided by an eccle-'siastical assembly or council.'—*Mosheim*, vol. v. p. 450. 'The Cal-'vinists are not particular in this; and indeed it is natural that debates, 'purely theological, should be discussed in an assembly of divines.'—*Note, Ibid. Maclaine.*

had known concerning the same from this conference, should be reserved to the judgment of a provincial Synod; and in order to this, that all things whatever, which should there be treated of by word of mouth, being afterwards sealed up in writing, those writings should be exhibited to the Synod.

The same persons also thought it a shameful thing, (*indignum*,) that Adolphus Venator who, on account of his doctrine and impure life, had been suspended from the ministry by the lawful censures of the churches, should be brought forward (or employed, *adhiberi*) in such a conference, to the great detriment of ecclesiastical censures. Wherefore they demanded, that another person should be taken in his place; which, as Arminius vehemently struggled against it, they were not able to obtain. In the beginning also, a disputation occurred concerning the order of handling the articles. For Arminius seemed to place the great defence of his cause in this, that the beginning should be made with the article of predestination. Gomarus thought, that because the article which respected justification seemed more necessary, the beginnings should be made with it; which also pleased the Illustrious the States.*

Concerning this article, there was the same controversy, which had previously been agitated before the supreme court, namely, Whether faith, inasmuch as it is an *act* according to the gracious estimation of God, be that righteousness itself by which we are justified before God. In the second place, it was treated concerning the doctrine of divine predestination, which Arminius endeavoured to render odious by the same consequences, which he had lately brought

* Arminius in this point, shewed his sound policy: for when declamations against predestination have prepared the way, a prejudice as to the other doctrines connected with it, or held by those who hold that offensive doctrine, will seldom be impartially considered. Some modern refuters of Calvinism either have not been so *politick*, or they have been *more fair*, in this respect than Arminius was.

forward in the convention of the Illustrious the States. But Gomarus urged the principal point, namely, Whether faith were the *antecedent cause* or *condition* of election, or whether indeed the *fruit* or *effect* of the same. The third controversy was concerning the grace of God and free-will. Arminius professed that he acknowledged all the operations of divine grace, whatever could be assigned in the conversion of man; only that no grace should be assigned, which is *irresistible*. Gomarus shewed what ambiguity and what guile might be concealed under that word *irresistible*: namely, that indeed under the same might be hidden the doctrine of the Semi-Pelagians, and the Synergists (Co-operators) which had been condemned of old: and he stated, that in the regeneration of man, that grace of the Holy Spirit was necessary; which works so efficaciously, that the resistance of the flesh being overcome, whosoever are made partakers of this grace, are certainly and infallibly converted to God by the same. Finally, they treated concerning the perseverance of the truly believing. Arminius declared, that he had never opposed the doctrine of the certain perseverance of the truly believing, nor thus far was he willing to oppose it, because those testimonies of scripture stood for it (or were extant for it) to which he was not as yet able to answer: he should therefore only propose those topicks, which in this article had excited scruple and hesitation in him.* When Gomarus had answered to these topicks, he confirmed this doctrine from the word of God by many evident testimonies.

* It is remarkable, that Arminius himself in this his last publick conference, and just before his death, should express himself so undecided on this grand point of decided and unqualified opposition to modern Arminians; and should make the concession, that he was not yet able to answer the scriptures, which seemed to favour the doctrine of the final perseverance in all true believers. It is worthy the serious consideration of his disciples.—He died Oct. 19, in this same year.

These things having been fully discussed, the collocutors were asked, whether there remained more articles, concerning which they differed from each other. Gomarus answered, that there were more: the articles for instance concerning original sin, the providence of God, the authority of the sacred scriptures, the assurance of salvation, the perfection of man in this life, and some others; concerning which, whether they should treat also in this place, he left to the prudence of the Illustrious the States; especially as they must a second time be discussed by them in the Synod. But when the state of Arminius's health did not seem such as could endure a longer conference, it pleased the Illustrious the States, that it should be broken off; after that they had promised, to the petition of Gomarus and the rest of the pastors who had joined themselves to him, that this entire cause should be more fully examined and decided on in a provincial Synod, to be called together as soon as might be; and had enjoined the collocutors, that each of them should exhibit to them his opinion, with the arguments and refutations of the contrary opinion, contained in a writing, within the space of fourteen days; in order that these writings might be preserved by them, even to the provincial Synod. Gomarus within the prescribed time transmitted his writings, which were afterwards published in Dutch (*Belgice*).

As the difficulties of the church were rather increased than taken away by this conference, the deputies of the churches submissively again petitioned the Illustrious the States, that the provincial Synod, so often before, and in the conference itself, promised, should be called, and also at the earliest time. Answer was returned to them, though there were certain persons who strove against it, that the convocation of it would then be appointed, when the pastors of the Alcmerian Class had obeyed the mandate of the Il-

lustrious the States, admitting to their assembly Adolphus Venator, and the pastors attached to him. But, lest that affair should delay the Provincial Synod, the deputies of the churches going to Alcmar, treated with the pastors of that Class concerning this admission, and so far prevailed on them, that they were ready to admit the pastors attached to Venator, on honourable conditions (or equitable, *honestis*): but they laid before the deputies so many and weighty reasons why they could not admit Venator himself, that they themselves judged, that in this respect, they ought not to be urged. When this had been reported to the Illustrious the States, not even yet could the calling of a Synod be obtained. For indeed the pastors attached to Arminius effected this, that it should be again enjoined to the Class of Alcmar, unreservedly to admit these pastors without any condition; which when they could not do, the calling *(of the Synod)* was again hindered.*

Arminius in the mean while excused himself to the Illustrious States by letters; that by reason of bodily weakness he was not able to prepare the writing enjoined him; which weakness so increased upon him by degrees, that a short time after he departed this life. [Oct. 19, 1609.]

* 'These measures confirmed, instead of removing the apprehensions 'of the Calvinists; from day to day they were still more firmly persuaded 'that the Arminians aimed at nothing less, than the ruin of all religion: and 'hence they censured their magistrates with great warmth and freedom, for 'interposing their authority to promote peace and union with such adver-'saries. And those, who are well informed and impartial, must candidly 'acknowledge, that the Arminians were far from being sufficiently cautious 'in avoiding connexions with persons of loose principles; and by frequenting 'the company of those whose sentiments were entirely different from the 'received doctrines of the reformed church, they furnished their enemies 'with a pretext for suspecting their own principles, and representing their 'theological system in the worst colours.' (Mosheim, vol. v. p. 445.) It seems evident that they *patronized* men not only of loose principles, but of licentious character. The word *Calvinists* is not used in the historical preface of the Synod of Dort.

Thus these contests and dissensions exercised the University and the churches of Batavia while Arminius was living; but when he was taken away from among the living, though every good man hoped, that a great part of these evils would be taken away and buried along with him, seeing, that he had been the leader and author of all these contentions; yet, as many pastors, every where in the churches of Holland, had consented to his opinion, and would not cease from propagating it, the deputies of the churches thought, that nevertheless the convocation of a provincial Synod should be urged; to whom it was again answered, that the Illustrious the States would then consider about calling some ecclesiastical convention, when the Class of Alcmar had obeyed their mandates.

In the mean time the pastors attached to Arminius, when they saw the affair brought into such a situation, that, the calling of a Synod having been hindered, little seemed to be feared by them from ecclesiastical judgments and censures; as if with loosened reins of boldness and impudence, they began to inveigh and rage furiously, both in publick and private, against the orthodox doctrine of the reformed churches, concerning election, the perseverance of the saints, the assurance of salvation, and other articles, with the most bitter and contumelious revilings, with the greatest offence of the pious, and the congratulation of adversaries, and disturbance of the churches; and to render the doctrine of the churches by all means suspected by the people, and to embitter the minds, especially of the nobles, *(magnatum)* against it, and the faithful teachers of the same. Neither was it sufficient for them, by private whisperings, and publick and official sermons *(tribunitiis)* to excite the minds, as well of the common people as of the rulers; but by publick writings also, which in great number, and not with less scandal, were daily every where dispersed among the people,

they so defamed *(proscindebant*, cut up*)* the doctrine of the reformed churches, that the sworn adversaries of the same had scarcely been able to do it with greater virulence and evil speaking. And, that they might the better conciliate to themselves the favour of the magistrates, and render their minds more and more bitter against the rest of the pastors, by Utenbogardus, at first in a speech made in the convention of the Illustrious the States, and then publickly in writing, they endeavoured to persuade the magistrates, that the rest of the pastors diminished and undermined the authority of the magistrates, and affected and arrogated to themselves a power collateral, or equal to their power.

Wherefore the deputies of the churches judged, that the Illustrious the States should be again approached, and intreated, that they would deign at length to apply a legal remedy to these evils, which seemed now to have come to the height, by calling together a Provincial Synod. And when the Illustrious the States seemed easily about to consent, because of the extreme necessity of the matter, the pastors attached to the opinions of Arminius suggested to them a new counsel, by which they thought that this calling *(*of a Synod*)* might either be entirely hindered, or be so instituted, that their cause might be in safety: namely, if the persons, from among whom the Synod was to be called, should not be delegated by the churches, (as was equitable, and had been hitherto the custom,) but be called forth by the States themselves: for they would easily afterwards obtain that those only should be selected, who either were attached to their cause, or too little averse from it. This innovation, though they had already persuaded some of the chief persons of the country, the more prudent could not approve; who judged that this convocation (of a Synod) should be instituted after the accustomed manner. They effected, nevertheless, that, while a disputation was excited among the Illustrious the

States, concerning the manner of calling the Synod, that the convocation itself, (which in the first place these pastors regarded,) not only of the Provincial Synod, but of the Annual Synods, and those which before were ordinarily held, should by this means be entirely hindered. For, as often as they who wished, that these evils should be taken away from the churches by this lawful remedy, made mention concerning the convocation of any Synod; so often they who favoured Arminius and his cause, renewed the contentions concerning the manner of calling it. Wherefore the pastors also, who were attached to the opinions of the same, (Arminius,) when they discerned that matters were now brought to that situation, that the fear of all ecclesiastical judgment and censure seemed to be taken away, being rendered more daring, their own churches not having been consulted, or aware of it, and without the authority of the supreme magistrate, they privately met together in a great number; and there, having entered into confederacy or conspiracy, by the subscription of names, they formed a *body*, as they called it, separate from the body of the rest of their fellow pastors, and instituted a manifest schism in the reformed churches. At this time they exhibited a suppliant writing, *(libellum,)* or, as they called it, the Remonstrance, to the Illustrious the States of Holland and West Friesland; from which they were afterwards called *Remonstrants*. In this they placed before them the doctrine of the reformed churches, concerning the divine predestination, and the perseverance of the saints, unfaithfully, (*mala fide*,) and not without open and atrocious slanders,* that by this means they might render it odious to the Illustrious orders; at the same time they

* It seems a sort of *right by prescription* to Anticalvinists, to misrepresent and bear false witness against the Calvinistick doctrines, and those who hold them: I would that no Calvinist had ever imitated them in this respect.

added that declaration of their own opinion concerning the same articles, which they under the ambiguous coverings of words concealed, that so it might appear to the more unskilful not much distant from the truth. And moreover they petitioned from the Illustrious the States, to be received under their patronage and protection, against all the censures of the churches.

This matter vehemently affected all the Belgick churches with amazement and grief, *(perculit,)* as they saw that these controversies had now burst forth into an open schism; and they used every endeavour that they might be able to procure a copy of this *remonstrance*, by which means an answer might be returned to the calumnies of these persons. But, by the favour of him who was used to keep these things, they (the Remonstrants) easily obtained, that not one copy could come into the hands of the rest of the pastors. Another thing was added to this calamity of the churches, which above measure increased their anxiety and their difficulties. For when a successor was sought to J. Arminius in the Professorship of theology, the deputies of the churches strenuously requested and adjured the most Ample the Directors of the University of Leyden, in the publick name of the churches, that they would substitute in that place a man clear from all suspicion of heterodoxy; in order that by this means the controversies in the University of Leyden might gradually cease, and their peace be restored to the churches: at the same time they commended certain eminent theologians, as well foreign as Belgick, to the directors; but without success *(irrito successu)*. For the Remonstrants, who seem to have pre-occupied the minds of certain persons, effected by their commendations, that Conradus Vorstius, a Professor of Steinfurt, a man for many years justly suspected by the reformed churches of Socinianism, should be called to the Professorship of Theology in the place of Arminius, and

for that cause that Utenbogardus should be sent away to Steinfurt: which thing when the deputies of the churches had understood, they thought it to belong to their duty, to admonish the Illustrious the States, that a man of this kind might not rashly be admitted to this vocation, who might be as a nail or claw in an ulcer, especially in so disturbed a state of the churches. Moreover, that this might be done by them with the greater fruit, they petitioned by letters from the venerable the Theological Faculty of the University of Heidelberg, to whom this Vorstius had been intimately known, that it would sincerely declare, whether it thought that this Vorstius, in the present state of things, could with profit, and the peace and edification of the churches, be placed over the education of youth in the University of Leyden. It was also answered (by this Theological Faculty) that a certain book of his had lately been published concerning God and the divine attributes, in which he refuted *(convelleret)* the doctrine both of ancient and modern theologians; and taught, that God was as to essence, great, finite, composed of essence and accident, changeable in his will, and obnoxious to passive power, *(passivæ potentiæ,)* with other similar portents. And that he had been sent ten years since to Heidelberg, that he might clear himself before the Theological Faculty, D. Pezelius also being present, from (*the charge*) of Socinianism, of which had been accused by the churches. And indeed that he had so cleared himself, a writing (*syngrapha*) having been left: but that this clearing of himself (*purgationem*) had not been made valid; but, on the contrary, too often and by various means he had rendered himself more suspected; because he carried in his head a nest of monstrous fancies, (*portentorum,*) with which he had hitherto polluted the school and the youth at Steinfurt: but if a man of so suspected a faith should be called to the most illustrious University of Leyden, this

would be nothing other than to extinguish a conflagration with oil.

When not only the deputies of the churches, but also the most ample the magistrates of the principal cities of Holland, of Dort for instance, and Amsterdam, had signified these things to the lords the curators, and to the Illustrious the States themselves; and intreated that they would not exasperate the difficulties of the churches, and expose them to the danger of new and greater (evils) by this calling of that man; the Remonstrants laboured with all their powers that they would not desist from this purposed calling (of him); for they persuaded them that this would be joined with the loss of their own authority. In the mean time, Vorstius came into Holland; who, after he had been heard in the convention of the Illustrious the States, Utenbogardus alone of the pastors being present, returned to Steinfurt.

About this time, when certain students of sacred theology, having been called to the ministry of the word in the divers Classes, were about to be subjected to examination, the Remonstrants procured it to be enjoined to these Classes, by the counsellors of the Illustrious the States, that no further declaration should be demanded from any one, in the examination, concerning the article of predestination, and the heads annexed to it, than what had been expressed in five articles of the Remonstrants, which were sent along with (this injunction); and at the same time, it was strictly forbidden, that any should be driven away from the ministry of those, who professed that they thought in the before mentioned articles with the Remonstrants.* When the

* The five articles of the Contra-Remonstrants so often mentioned in this history, do not occur separately and all together in the authenticated documents, of which I make use, but comparing the detached accounts of them, and the arguments used in the Synod of Dort, concerning them, with the following statement from Mosheim,

pastors, on many accounts, were very reluctant (*gravarentur*) to consent to this, the deputies of the churches having been asked by them, laid open their grievances, in the next election of the Illustrious the States of Holland and West Friezland; and at the same time declared, that they

(vol. v. p. 444, 445,) the latter appears sufficiently accurate for our present purpose.

1. "That God, from all eternity, determined to bestow salvation "on those who, as he foresaw, would persevere unto the end in their "faith in Christ Jesus, and to inflict everlasting punishment on those "who should continue in their unbelief, and resist, to the end of life, "his divine succours.

2. "That Jesus Christ, by his death and sufferings, made an atone-"ment for the sins of mankind in general, and of every individual in "particular: that, however, none but those who believe in him can "be partakers of that divine benefit.

3. "That *true faith* cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural "faculties and powers, or from the force and operation of free-will, "since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable "either of thinking or doing any good thing; and that therefore it is "necessary to his conversion and salvation that he be *regenerated* and "renewed by the operation of the Holy Ghost, which is the gift of "God, through Jesus Christ.

4. "That this *divine grace*, or energy of the Holy Ghost, which "heals the disorders of a corrupt nature, begins, advances, and brings "to perfection every thing that can be called *good* in man; and that, "consequently, all good works, without exception, are to be attributed "to God alone, and to the operation of his grace: that, nevertheless, "this grace does not *force* the man to act against his inclination, but "may be *resisted* and rendered *ineffectual* by the perverse will of the "impenitent sinner.

5. "That they who are united to Christ by faith are thereby fur-"nished with abundant strength, and with succours sufficient to enable "them to triumph over the seductions of Satan, and the allurements "of sin and temptation; but that the question, *Whether such may fall "from their faith, and forfeit finally this state of grace?* has not been "yet resolved with sufficient perspicuity, and must therefore, be yet "more carefully examined by an attentive study of what the holy "Scriptures have declared in relation to this important point."

'It is to be observed, that this last article was afterwards changed 'by the Arminians, who, in process of time, declared their sentiments 'with less caution, and positively affirmed, that *the saints might fall* '*from a state of grace.*' Mosheim, vol. v. p. 445.

were prepared to prove in a lawful Synod, that those articles of the Remonstrants were contrary to the word of God, and the Confession and Catechism of the Belgick churches: and they intreated the Illustrious the States, not to suffer these heterodox articles, having never been duly examined in a lawful assembly of the churches, to be obtruded in this manner on the churches; but rather, that they would call together the provincial Synod so often petitioned for, nay, now for a long time earnestly sought, in which these articles might be first examined according to the rule of the divine word. They shewed also, with how great scandal and detriment of the churches, it would be joined, if the appointed calling of Vorstius should proceed. And further they request, that this should be hindered by the authority of the Illustrious the States.

A consultation having been held concerning these things, it was determined, that a conference should be appointed, at the next Comitia of the count of Hague, in the convention itself of the Illustrious the States, on these five articles of the Remonstrants, between six pastors, to be chosen by each party. The Remonstrants had chosen for themselves, by the deputies of the several Classes, John Utenbogardus, of the Hague; Adrian Borrius, and John Arnoldi Corvin of Leyden; Nicolas Grevinchovius of Rotterdam; Edward Poppius of Goudan, and Simon Episcopius, pastors of the church of Bleswick. But the rest of the pastors had chosen, by the deputies of each of the Classes, Peter Plancinus of Amsterdam; Libertus Frascinus of Brilan; Ruardus Acronius of Schiedam; John Beccius of Dort; John Bogardus of Harlem; and Festus Hommius of Leyden, pastors of the church.

March 11, 1611.] When they had met together, the Remonstrants refused to institute the conference with the other six pastors, as with the deputies of the Classes of Holland

and West Friezland, such as they shewed themselves to be by letters of commission (*fidei*), lest they should seem to be the adversaries of the churches: moreover they protested that they would depart, the matter being left unfinished, (*re infecta*,) unless these would lay aside that character. When there had been for a long time much disputation, the rest of the pastors chose rather to yield to their importunity, than to contend any longer concerning that matter. And they who had been deputed by the Classes, before they went in to the conference, besought the Illustrious lords the States, that the promise which had been made to the churches more than two years before, in the conference held between Arminius and Gomarus, (namely, that the conference being ended, the judgment of this cause might be permitted and reserved to a provincial, or national Synod,) might here also be renewed.

It was agreed upon that this order of proceeding should be observed by them; that each party should comprise in writing the arguments of its own opinion; concerning which a conference should then be instituted by word of mouth. Before they came to the examination of the articles, the pastors, whom we before said had been deputed by the Classes, exhibited an answer to the suppliant writing (*libellum*) of the Remonstrants, a copy of which they had procured a little before the conference; in which they shewed, that the Remonstrants had most unfaithfully (*pessima fide*) set forth the opinion of the reformed churches, and had feigned in addition to it (*adfinxisse*) many things as a calumny: and that they had not openly avowed their own (opinion), or set forth all the articles concerning which there was a controversy. And, seeing there were more controverted heads, besides those which were explained in these five articles, they humbly prayed, that, by the authority of the Illustrious the States, it might be enjoined on the

Remonstrants, that they should likewise roundly and openly declare themselves concerning all the rest. Therefore, when the first article of the Remonstrants was about to be discussed, (or canvassed, *excutiendus*) in which it is stated, 'that God had from eternity decreed to save persevering believers,' which no Christian denies; and this article was so placed by them, as that which contained the doctrine concerning God's eternal election; the Remonstrants were asked, that (in addition) to the declaration of their opinion, as expressed in this article, they would explain these two things. First, Whether they would maintain that this article contained the whole decree of predestination; secondly, Whether they thought, that this faith and perseverance in the faith were *causes* and *conditions* which *preceded* election unto salvation; or *fruits* which *spring from* election, and follow after it. After they had shifted about for some time, they answered at length, to the first indeed, that they acknowledged no other predestination to salvation, than that which had been expressed by them in the first article; but to the second, that faith in the consideration and view of God was prior to election to salvation; and that it did not follow in the manner of any fruit. They then proposed in return seven other questions, as well concerning election, as reprobation, to which they desired an answer to be given by the pastors deputed from the Classes. These, as they did not belong to the state of the controversy concerning the first article, and moreover were most of them mutilated and intricate, were proposed by them, that by this method they might draw them from the principal state of the controversy, and the right manner of treating it into doubtful disputations (*ambages*).* The pastors, having shewn by a libel (*libellum*) to the Illustrious the States this unjust

* A common method among many controversialists, expressively called, 'throwing dust in men's eyes.'

way of proceeding, did not indeed intreat that they might not manifest their own opinion concerning reprobation; as the Remonstrants had too often iniquitously (*improbe*) objected to the same persons; but declared expressly their opinion, as far as they thought might suffice for the peace and edification of the churches, not only by word of mouth, but also in writing: That indeed when they state the eternal decree concerning the election of individual persons, they at the same time state the eternal decree concerning the reprobation or rejection of certain individual persons: because it could not be, that there should be election, but moreover there must be, at the same time, a certain reprobation or dereliction. Yet to rashly canvass all these difficult questions concerning this article, was nothing else, but to fill the church with useless disputations and contentions not profitable, and to disturb its peace. That this their declaration suppliantly expressed in this libel, ought to suffice all men of moderate dispositions and lovers of peace: namely, that it was indeed believed and taught by them, that God condemned no one; yea, neither had he decreed to condemn any one, unless justly for his own proper sins.*

It therefore pleased the Illustrious the States, that, leaving these thorny questions, they should come to the discussion of the articles. The pastors deputed by the churches, proposed in writing their reasons, on account of which, they disapproved of each of these articles. The Remonstrants also, on the other side, exhibited in writing their own arguments, by which they thought that each of them might be confirmed. About these reasons and arguments, dispu-

* 'That God, by an absolute decree had elected to salvation a very 'small number of men, without any regard to their faith and obe-'dience whatever; and secluded from saving grace all the rest of mankind, 'and appointed them by the same decree to eternal damnation, without 'any regard to their infidelity or impenitency.' Heylin's 1st. Article of the Synod of Dort.

tations were held by speaking, in the full convention of the Illustrious the States. The parts of the collocutor, in the name of those deputed by the churches, were sustained by Festus Hommius; but in the name of the Remonstrants, at first by Adrian Borrius, and then by Nicolas Grevinchovius, John Arnoldi, and Simon Episcopius, succeeding each other by turns.

While the pastors were occupied in this conference, Conr. Vorstius had returned out of Westphalia into Holland, whom the Illustrious the States appointed to be heard in a full convention, all the collocutors being present. When they were come together, he made a prolix oration, in which he endeavoured to clear himself from the errors *objected* to him. Then the collocutors were asked, whether they had any considerations, on account of which they judged that the calling of Vorstius, to the professorship of theology in the university of Leyden, should be hindered. The Remonstrants expressly declared, that they had nothing against Vorstius; neither had they detected any thing in his writings, which was repugnant to truth and piety.* The other pastors exhibited in writing their reasons, for which they judged that this vocation would be vehemently mischievous and disgraceful to the churches of Holland: and they shewed from a book of Socinus, concerning the authority of the sacred scriptures, edited by Vorstius himself, and interpolated; and also from that, which Vorstius himself had very lately written and published concerning God and the divine attributes, his principal errors, concerning which there was held during some days a conference between him and Festus Hommius, in the convention of the Illustrious the States, in

* 'Among the persecuted ecclesiastics was the famous Vorstius, who 'by his religious sentiments, which differed but little from the Socinian 'system, had rendered the Arminians particularly odious.' Mosheim, vol. v. p. 455.

the presence of the collocutors. This having been finished, the pastors on each side were again asked by the Illustrious the States, that they would sincerely, and without any passions (*affectibus*) declare, whether Vorstius by his answers seemed to have satisfied them. The Remonstrants answered, that full satisfaction had been given to them by Vorstius; and they moreover judged, that it would be very useful to the churches and to the University, if his vocation proceeded. The rest of the pastors declared in writing, that the answers of Vorstius were so far from having moved them from their former opinion, that by them they were the more confirmed in that opinion: and that his vocation could not be forwarded, except by the extreme detriment of the churches and of the University, and the manifest danger of still greater disturbance; to which, that they might not rashly expose the churches by this vocation, they submissively adjured (or *obtested*) the Illustrious the States, that, dismissing Vorstius, they might return to the conference concerning the five articles of the Remonstrants: and when this, having been continued during some days, was at length brought to a conclusion, the Illustrious the States commanded the collocutors on each side, that those things which had been spoken, *viva voce*, and whatever they might judge necessary to a more full answer, being on each side comprised in writing, should by Utenbogardus and Festus be exhibited to the Illustrious the States. And in the mean time, that the pastors might not glory among themselves, concerning the victory, which they had gained one over the other, but that they might teach moderately with edification concerning the controverted articles, and live among themselves in peace and charity; they determined that these articles should be left in the same state, in which they had been before the conference.

In the cause of Vorstius nothing was at that time decided:

but when a little time afterwards, the most ample the magistrates of the city of Dort, by their delegates, most ample men, D. Hugo Musius, ab Holii the Prætor (or Mayor), James Wittius, Adrian Repelarius, John Berkius, the Syndich, requested the Illustrious the States, seeing rumours concerning the errors and heresies of Vorstius, became daily more and more frequent, that his vocation might be broken off, or at least deferred; the Illustrious the States commanded the curators of the University, to proceed no further in his vocation. And when the report of his vocation had come to James the First himself, the most Serene and powerful king of Great Britain, the Defender of the Faith, who out of his admirable skill in theological matters, especially in a king, and for his singular zeal towards the reformed religion, when he had himself carefully read the tract of Vorstius concerning God, and had noted the principal errors with his own hand, judged that the Illustrious the High Mightinesses the States General, his neighbours and allies, were to be admonished, as well by letters, (the catalogue of his errors being also transmitted,) as by his own ambassador, an Illustrious person, D. Rodolphus Winwood, not to admit a man infamous by so many and so great errors and blasphemies, to the publick office of teaching in the University; but rather to banish him from their borders: lest if the youth should be imbued by him with these wicked and execrable errors, the state should by little and little go to decay; seeing that, by the purity of the reformed doctrine, in which the Belgick churches had hitherto cultivated an amicable agreement with the English, and in the preservation of it, the safety of the republick itself was concerned.* When this was delayed, the Re-

* This at least shews the general judgment of theologians concerning Vorstius, whom the Remonstrants so zealously supported; and

monstrants earnestly striving against it, and especially Vorstius, by various explanations, apologies, prologues (*prodromis*), and answers, as well modest, as more fully excusing and strengthening (*incrustante*) his own errors; yet his most Serene Royal Majesty did not desist to urge his dismission, sometimes repeating his admonitions, and even adding a serious protestation.*

While these things were doing, certain students of sacred theology who likewise had come forth from the instruction and the house of Vorstius, in the University of Franekar, which they had now been sedulously employed in infecting with Socinian errors, published in print a certain little book of Faustus Socinus, concerning the duty of a Christian man; in which persuasions are given, that all who would consult the salvation of their own souls, having deserted the dogmas and assemblies of the Reformed churches, should embrace the opinion of the Phothinians and the Ebonites; adding a preface, in which they diligently commend this book unto the churches.† The Illustrious the States of Friezland, having been assured of this, and having at the same time

even still more strongly, on the supposition that James and his select divines, were not at that time favourable to Calvinism.

* This shews what the generally received *doctrine* of the church of England was then supposed to be; viz. for substance the same as that of the Belgick church. The eulogium on James I. reminds us of the words of Cowper, 'Grant me discernment, I allow it you:' yet the English divines have spoken still more decidedly on the subject. (Preface to Translation of the Bible.) It may be supposed, that the Belgick divines, who adhered to the Synod of Dort, would retract or qualify this eulogium, when they learned the change which soon after took place in England under the patronage of the same James.

†. 'Photinus's opinions concerning the Deity, were equally repugnant 'to the orthodox and Arian systems.'—See Mosheim, vol. i. p. 425, 426. 'Though the Ebonites believed the celestial mission of Christ and his 'participation of a divine nature, yet they regarded him as a man born 'of Joseph and Mary, according to the ordinary course of nature.'—Ibid. vol. i. p. 214, 215.

procured certain familiar letters of these students, in which they declared, by what arts the common cause of Socinianism, (which they not obscurely intimated was also carried on by Vorstius and by Utenbogardus and others in Holland), might be occultly and safely propagated; having taken care that the most of these copies of this book should be destroyed by the avenging flames, and having expelled the students from their confines; they, at first indeed by letters admonished the magistrates of the principal cities of Holland; and then by the most noble person Kempson a Donia, the Illustrious lords the States themselves; and they requested, inasmuch as the orthodox consent in the reformed doctrine was the principal bond and foundation of union, among the confederated provinces, that they would not admit, by the vocation of one man, thus suspected of manifest heresies, this agreement to be enfeebled; nor suffer themselves to be led about by artifices and frauds of this kind, by which it was evident, that these men secretly attempted this. But the pastors of Leoward having made publick the above mentioned letters of the students, with necessary annotations, solemnly warned all the churches, to take heed to themselves against artifices of this kind, and especially the deceitful machinations of the hereticks, and in the first place of Vorstius. The Illustrious dukedom of Gueldria and county of Lutphan also warned the Illustrious the States of Holland, concerning the same thing, who answered, that nothing would be more their hearty desire and care, than that they might retain, in the common business of religion, this consent with the rest of the federated provinces inviolate. Concerning which their constant purpose, they peculiarly requested, that their federated neighbours would be assured. In the mean time, that they themselves would have regard to this admonition. And they command Vorstius, to remove his place of abode from the city of Leyden to Gouda, and there to

vindicate himself from the errors objected to him by publick writings, as much as he could.

Then the same, the lords the States, decreed, that they who held the conference at the Hague should on each side exhibit in writing the state of the controversy concerning the five articles of the Remonstrants; and should at the same time add their counsels, by what method they thought that these controversies might be most advantageously composed to the peace of the church and the good of the republick. The Remonstrants judged, that no more certain method of concord could be entered on, than a mutual toleration, by which each party might be permitted, freely to teach and contend for his own opinion concerning these articles.* The other pastors declared that they could not show a more advantageous way, than that as soon as possible, and on the first opportunity, a national Synod should be called together by the authority of the Illustrious the High Mightinesses the States General; in which, these and all other controversies having been clearly explained and examined, it might be determined which opinion agreed with the word of God, and the common judgment of the reformed churches, and on that account ought to be publickly taught; lest, by the agitating of discordant opinions, truth should be injured, or the peace of the churches disturbed.

* Such a toleration amounted to an entire abolition of the Belgick Confession and Catechism, without any previous interference of those Synods, Classes, and Presbyteries, which were essential to their form of church-government. As if, under the name of toleration here in England, the whole establishment of the church, without any reference to the authority which established it, should be disannulled by one royal or senatorial mandate; and all preferments in the church and Universities thrown open to men of every creed and character. James the Second attempted a little in this way in order to bring in popery, but the dissenters in general opposed this his dispensing power: and few if any of modern dissenters, who make the highest claims of something above toleration, mean such a complete abolition of the present state of things, by the same despotick authority as this implied.

On these counsels the opinions of the Illustrious the States were various; some approving the counsel of the Remonstrants, and others that of the rest of the pastors, which was the cause, that nothing was determined in this matter, by which an end might be put to these controversies.

Dec. 3, 1611.] But when the Illustrious the States had understood that, besides these five articles, concerning many other things controversies of no small importance were moved; in order that they might meet the innovations maturely, they appointed, that the doctrine of the holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, should be most purely set forth, as well in the churches as in the publick schools of these regions; and to this end, in the churches and in the publick *schools of* Holland and West Friezland; that, concerning the perfect satisfaction of our Saviour Jesus Christ for our sins, concerning the justification of man before God, concerning saving faith and original sin, and the certitude of salvation, and the perfection of man in this life, nothing should be taught otherwise, than as it is every where delivered in the reformed churches, and hath been hitherto delivered in these provinces. In the mean while, every where in the churches, discords, scandals, disturbances and confusions increased in a deplorable manner. For the Remonstrants laboured assiduously with all their powers, that the pastors who especially resisted their attempts, (the magistrates having been excited against them by false accusations,) should not only be cast out of their ministerial stations, but out of the cities themselves; and that on all the churches which were deprived of pastors, even when reluctant and struggling against it, those should be obtruded, who were addicted to their own opinions; all others being excluded wherever they were able, though excellently furnished with learning, piety, and necessary endowments, and lawfully sought out and called by the

church.* And this was the cause, that the orthodox churches could not consider, as their lawful pastors, pastors of this kind; who had either oppressed and cast out their innocent colleagues, contrary to all law and justice, or who had been obtruded on them against their will, and who had reviled the doctrine of the reformed churches, in the most virulent sermons, daily and in a horrid manner; that they could not hear their sermons, or partake of the Lord's supper along with the same; but that they chose rather to go to the sermons of orthodox pastors in the adjacent places; though they were exposed to many reproaches, disgraces, and injuries on that account. And these were the beginnings and occasions of the separations from the Remonstrants.†

The church at Alcmar was the first among all, which was compelled to institute a separation of this kind. For Adolphus Venator the pastor of that church, having been suspended from the office of teaching, as well for his too impure life, as for his most impure doctrine, by the churches of North Holland, despising the censures of the churches, nevertheless persisted in the office of teaching. And now that the magistracy having been changed, as it was used to be done every year, such persons had been lawfully chosen as seemed least to favour his party, and on whose patronage he could no longer depend; having excited the people against the lawful magistracy, he effected that they (the common people) having seized arms by sedition, would not be appeased, before the lawful magistracy, having abdicated themselves,

* The toleration which these men pleaded for, was precisely like that which papists demand as emancipation; that is, power and full liberty to draw over others to their party by every artful means; till they become strong enough to refuse toleration to all other men.

† Here was a schism begun, as several others have been: but did all the blame lie on those who separated from the rest? On the other hand, Would such a toleration as is here described, meet the wishes and claims of the advocates for toleration, who in this transaction, as in many others, are imposed upon by a favourite term, however misapplied?

certain others were substituted to the same, men estranged from the reformed religion, and addicted to the party of Venator. These men, as soon as they had been established in the government of the city, at Venator's instigation, at first commanded the elders and deacons to go out of their office; and then they also deprived of their ministerial stations two pastors, because they had opposed themselves against the errors of Venator; of whom the one, Peter Cornelii, for almost fifty years had presided over that church with the greatest edification, the other Cornelius Hillenius, a man of the most upright faith and life, and a very earnest (*accerrimum*) defender of the orthodox doctrine, they most unworthily cast forth as driven out of the city. This separation (at Alcmar) the church at Rotterdam was compelled to imitate: for Nicolas Grevinchovius, when he saw his colleague Cornelius Gezelius most acceptable to the church at Rotterdam, on account of his singular piety, modesty, and sincerity, and that by his endeavours, he vehemently resisted the introduction of the doctrine of the Remonstrants; procured, that by the magistracy of that place, he should first be deprived of his ministry and then driven out of the city by the publick beadles (*lictores*).* The pastors also of the Class of Rotterdam, attached to the purity of doctrine, declined holding the meetings of the Class with this Grevinchovius, and others who had been drawn over by him to the opinion of the Remonstrants, when the magistracy of Rotterdam by authority had obtruded Simon Episcopius, to whom the church of Amsterdam in which he had lived, had refused to give a testimonial of doctrine and life, on the unwilling church of Bleyswick, contrary to the preferable

* The names both of the persecuted and persecuting pastors are given in this history; but the names of the magistrates who concurred in the persecution are withheld, in honour as it may seem of the magistracy. This greatly accords to the narrative in the Acts of the Apostles.

(*potiora*) suffrages of the pastors. Many churches also in the villages, on which either Remonstrants had been obtruded against their will, or whose pastors had revolted to the Remonstrants, because they could not hear without the greatest offence, and sorrow, and perturbation of mind, those horrid railings against the orthodox doctrine, which were daily heard in their sermons, having left their temples they either went to the sermons of the neighbouring orthodox pastors; or where these could not be had at their own villages they were instructed by other pastors, or by orthodox candidates for the ministry, in separated assemblies; which when the Remonstrants had in vain attempted to hinder by the edicts of their magistrates, they excited no small persecution against these churches.*

In the mean time, the lords the curators of the University of Leyden, by the counsel of the Remonstrants called M. Simon Episcopius to the professorship of theology, that very renowned man Dr. John Polyander, who had been called to the same professorship in the place of F. Gomarus, being unwilling and struggling against it. This augmented not a little the grief and anxiety of the churches; when from this it appeared, that it was determined by them (the curators) to cherish contentions in that University, and to establish the doctrine of the Remonstrants. But as these evils now could scarcely any longer be contained within the limits of the churches of Holland; this contagion at length pervaded, in the first place, the neighbouring churches of Gueldria, the province of Utrecht and Transisulania. In the diocese of Utrecht, by the negligence of the pastors, the ecclesiastical order seemed fallen down. And under the

* This was their *toleration!* Certainly, according to this history, the persecution *began* on the part of the Remonstrants; nor does the contrary appear that I can learn from other histories. The Contra-Remonstrants appealed to existing laws and to legal Synods; the Remonstrants used the illegal aid of penal edicts and secular magistrates.

pretext of restoring it, Utenbogardus introduced into that church some Remonstrant pastors, and among them, one James Taurinus, a fierce and turbulent man. These (pastors) from that time gave diligence, not only in this city, but in the whole province, by ejecting every where the orthodox pastors, and substituting Remonstrants in their places; that the doctrine of the Remonstrants alone should publickly prevail. But in order to establish their cause in the same province, they devised a new formular of ecclesiastical government, which at first had been approved by the Synod, in which Utenbogardus the pastor of the Hague presided, and then through the endeavour of the same person, by the Illustrious the States of that province likewise. In the fourth and fifth article of the second chapter, the toleration of the opinion of the Remonstrants, which in Holland they so greatly urged, was established; where also the doctrine of the reformed churches is obliquely and odiously traduced. Finally very many new things in the government of the churches, occur every where in this formular (*formula*). So that from the same it might appear, that nothing other was proposed by these men, than that they might make all things new, not only in doctrine, but in the external government of the church by rites (*gubernatione ritibus ecclesiæ*).

And now also in Gueldria, the Remonstrants had drawn over to their party, the pastors of Neomagen, Bommelien, and Tilan; who from that time placed over the ministerial charges of the neighbouring churches, only men of their own opinion. And that they might do this with the more freedom and safety, Utenbogardus, Borrius, and Taurinus, going into Gueldria, when the comitia of the Illustrious the States were celebrated in the same place, with the other Remonstrants effected this, that in the province also, the ordinary and annual meeting of the Synods should be prevented. In Transisulania also, some pastors, especially in

the church of Campen and Daventer, by the endeavour and artifices of certain persons, had been drawn over to the opinion of the Remonstrants; who in those places thenceforth disturbed peaceable churches with new contentions.

Sept. 27, 1612.] When the Belgick churches saw that this evil, thus crept also into the other provinces, was spread abroad in them; as they judged it to be most highly necessary that it should be met as soon as possible, neither that the remedy should be any longer deferred, having communicated counsels one with another, they sent away two delegates from each of the provinces, to the Illustrious the High Mightinesses the States General: namely, from Gueldria, John Fontanus and William Baudartius; from Holland, Libertus Fraxinus and Festus Hommius; from Zeland, Herman Frankelius and William Telingius; (those of Utrecht refused to send their's;) from Friezland, Gellius Acronius and Godofrid Sopingius; from Transisulania, John Gosmannus and John Langius; finally, from the state of Groningen and Omlandia, Cornelius Hillenius and Wolfgang Agricola, who, together with the deputies of the church of Amsterdam, which was Synodal, Peter Plancius, and John Hallius, having set forth copiously the difficulties and dangers of the churches, as well in the name of the churches themselves, as also most of them in the name of the Illustrious the States of their own provinces, (whose letters also they set before them,) most strenuously requested and adjured the Illustrious their High Mightinesses the States General, that, pitying the most afflicted state of the churches, they would at length seriously think concerning a remedy of these evils; and for that purpose, at the earliest time call together a national Synod, (which had been) first promised many years before. Though most persons among the States General judged, that the convocation (of a Synod) was not to be deferred any longer, and even themselves

urged it: yet because the delegates of the province of Utrecht were absent, and those of Holland and West Friezland said, that they had not been furnished with mandates sufficiently clear as to that business, by those who delegated them; the matter was put off, until the delegates of all the provinces had agreed to it by their common suffrages, which was thenceforth hindered from being done, by the endeavour of the Remonstrants in Holland and Utrecht.

In the mean time, the Remonstrants did not desist from strenuously promoting their own cause, (or cease) to court (*aucupari*) the favour of the great men, to occupy the minds of the magistrates, to render suspected to the politicians and impede all Synodical meetings, to seize on the vacant churches, to propagate their own opinion by *sermons* and publick writings, to rail at the orthodox doctrine with horrid calumnies, to draw over the people to their party, and to alienate them more and more from the doctrine of the Reformed churches. For this purpose they earnestly scattered pamphlets (*libellos*) in great number, among the common people, written in the vulgar tongue, under the titles of 'The bells of a conflagration,' (*campanes incendiariæ*) 'A 'more compressed declaration,' 'A more direct way,' and others; in which they not only fought in defence of their own doctrine, but both excused Vorstius, and most atrociously, with a canine eloquence, canvassed the received doctrine of the Belgick churches, by most impudent calumnies, and most absurd consequences deduced wickedly and unjustly against the same. Hence bitter disputes and altercations were excited among the people, which sounded throughout all places: and the minds also of those who were most nearly related, (or connected, *conjunctissimorum*) having been embittered among themselves; (with the great wound of charity, and the disturbance of the churches and of the publick peace; and with the immense grief and

offence of the pious,) were torn asunder in the most miserable manner. And, as in most of the cities, they had the magistracy more favourable to them, and could do every thing, through J. Utenbogardus, with the advocate of Holland, they insolently exulted over the churches, and their fellow ministers.

In the mean while, all pious men, and lovers of their country and of religion, bewailed and wept over this most wretched calamity of the churches: and when they could not in their mind perceive, whither at length these tumults were about to grow, unless a remedy should be maturely applied; because this had not hitherto been practicable by publick authority; they began seriously to think, whether by some other way this evil might at least be stopped, if it could not be taken away. In the first place the most Illustrious the count of Nassau, William Lewis the Governor of Friezland, according to his extraordinary affection toward the churches and the republick, privately admonished as well Utenbogardus on the one side, as Festus Hommius on the other; that, seeing the state of the republick itself grievously assaulted by these ecclesiastical contentions, they should look well to it, in a friendly and brotherly manner between themselves, to see whether some honourable way might not be found out, of composing this most deplorable dissention, and of coming to an agreement. Festus declared, that if the Remonstrants differed from the rest of the pastors, in no other articles, than in those five concerning predestination, and the heads annexed to it, he thought that a way might be found out, in which some peace might be established between the parties, until the whole controversy should be settled by a national Synod. But because there were weighty reasons, on account of which the churches believed, that most of the Remonstrants dissented from the doctrine of the Belgick churches in more articles, and those of greater im-

portance: neither could it be done, (*fieri*) that under the pretext of these five articles, they should permit or suffer the most grievous errors to be brought into the same (churches;) there did not seem any hope of entering into agreement with the Remonstrants, unless they would sincerely (or unreservedly, *sincere*) declare, that except these five articles, they thought with the reformed Belgick churches in all the heads of doctrine.* Utenbogardus being interrogated as to these things, answered, that as far as he himself was concerned, he had nothing, beyond these five articles, in which he dissented; and that he would be always ready to declare sincerely his own opinion; nor did he doubt, but that the most of the Remonstrants would do the same; and that he did not wish for any thing more than that, for *this cause*, a conference might be instituted among some pastors of a more moderate disposition. And when he had repeated the same declaration privately to Festus at Leyda, it was agreed between them, that each of them should procure among his own friends, three pastors to be deputed on each side, who might in a friendly manner confer together, and seriously consider among themselves concerning a convenient way of peace, which afterwards might be communicated to the churches, and approved by them.

Feb. 27, A. D. 1513.] When the Illustrious the States of Holland understood that these counsels were privately agitated, they approved this their earnest endeavour, and com-

* As predestination, and the doctrines immediately and *evidently* connected with it, are more readily rendered odious in the view of mankind in general, than the other peculiar doctrines of Christianity: at that time, as well as at present, it was the policy of those whose real and declared views were opposed to others of these doctrines; to hold out to the publick, and to rulers especially, that the whole dispute, or difference, was about election and reprobation: while in refuting these articles they take in a much wider compass. But an obnoxious word will do a great deal of execution, on those who have not time or heart to examine the matter deeply.

manded in the publick name, that this conference should be held as soon as it could be done. Soon after, there met together, for this cause, in the city of Delph, on the part of the Remonstrants, John Utenbogardus, Adrian Borrius, and Nicolas Grevinchovius; on the part of the rest of the pastors, John Beccius, John Bogardus, and Festus Hommius. After that the Illustrious the States had, by their delegates, exhorted them seriously, that laying aside all resentments and evil affections, they would bend the whole energy of their capacity, that some way of peace among themselves might be found; and had declared that this would be at the same time acceptable to God, and to the churches and all pious men, and in the first place to themselves the Illustrious the States; and when each of these pastors had testified that they came together with a mind most earnestly desirous of peace, and that they would bring thither all things which could proceed from them, in order to conciliate peace, an amicable conference was held by them. In this the Remonstrants declared, that they were not able to shew any other way of peace, except a mutual toleration, as they called it: namely, that it should be freely permitted to each party, to teach publickly his own opinion, concerning those five articles; and they asked of the rest of the pastors, to declare whether they thought their opinion, expressed in these five articles, to be tolerable or not. If they thought that it was not tolerable, (or to be tolerated,) it was not necessary, that any further deliberation should be had, concerning the way of peace; as truly in their judgment no method then would remain of entering into peace. The rest of the pastors answered, that this appeared to them the safest and most advantageous way of peace; that seeing, they were, each of them, pastors of the reformed Belgick churches, and were desirous of being considered as such, each party should submit its own cause to the lawful decision of the Belgick

churches; and that it should for that end and purpose, seriously and sincerely labour, that a national Synod of the reformed churches should be called together, as speedily as might be, even, if it could be done, in the next summer, by the authority of the Illustrious and High Mightinesses the States General; in which the whole cause having been lawfully examined and discussed, it might either be determined which doctrine, as agreeable to the word of God, ought thenceforth to be taught in the churches; or that the plan of a toleration might be entered into, by the suffrages of all the churches, of that kind which might appear proper to be instituted from the word of God. That they were ready to subject themselves to the judgment of the Synod; if the Remonstrants were willing to do the same, thus peace might be accomplished: but that a toleration, such as they had hitherto used, and such as they seemed to request, being circumscribed by no laws, could not promote the peace of the churches; but if they would suffer it to be circumscribed with fair (or *honourable*) conditions, they were ready to confer with them concerning the same (conditions); provided they would assure the churches, by a sincere and open declaration, that they thought differently from these reformed churches, in no other heads of doctrine except these five articles.* But since the Illustrious the States, two years before, [Dec. 3, 1611.] had by name expressed six heads of doctrine, concerning which they forbad to be taught, otherwise than it had been hitherto delivered to the Belgick churches: namely, concerning the perfect satisfaction of our

* 'The demands of the Arminians were moderate; they required 'no more than a bare toleration of their religious sentiments; and some 'of the first men in the republic, such as Olden Barneveldt, Grotius, 'Hoogerberts, and several others, looked upon this demand as just and 'reasonable.' Mosheim, vol. v. p. 442. 'This toleration was offered to 'them in the conference holden at the Hague in 1611, provided they 'would renounce the errors of Socinianism.' Note by Maclaine.

Lord Jesus Christ for our sins, the justification of man before God, saving faith, original sin, the assurance (or certitude) of salvation, and concerning the perfection of man in this life; they in the first place demanded, that they would declare concerning these articles, that they embraced the opinion expressed in the Confession and Catechism of these churches, which they the other pastors had comprised from the same in certain written theses; and that they rejected the contrary opinion proposed in certain anti-theses, from the writings of Arminius, Bertius, Vorstius, Venator, and others. The Remonstrants replied (*regesserunt*) to this, that they could not see in what manner these controversies could be quieted (*sopiri*) by a national Synod; and truly in the present state of things, that they neither approved nor demanded its convocation: that this cause could not be helped by synodal decisions; nor did they think that Holland, in the concern of religion, would ever submit itself to the decisions of the other provinces. As to the declaration which was demanded, they would communicate with the other Remonstrants concerning the same: and when, on each side, they had comprised briefly in writing their own opinion, they departed, the business being left unfinished.* Afterwards the Illustrious the States called Utenbogardus and Festus to them, that they might know from them what had been done in this conference at Delph, and what hopes shone forth of concord being entered on. Festus sincerely

* The event was what might previously have been expected; indeed nothing else could come of such a conference, between parties whose sentiments were so entirely discordant (2 Cor. vi. 16—18.) The toleration demanded by the Remonstrants was in direct opposition to the existing laws, grounded on private or partial authority at best; like King James's claim of the dispensing power over acts of parliament in matters of religion, and indeed it amounted to a private repeal of those laws. The others were willing to consent to a legal and limited toleration. It is also evident, that their firm decision and opposition was not mainly about predestination and reprobation.

and without disguise (*nudeque*) related what had been done, and declared, that hope of peace shone forth, only provided the Remonstrants would openly declare their opinion on the articles delivered to them. Utenbogardus, by courtly craftiness, had procured that he should be heard alone, Festus being absent; that he might the more freely propose the things which he thought would serve his own purpose. And when he had odiously traduced the proceedings of the rest of the pastors, as the persons who, by the demand of a declaration, (which yet before the conference he himself had promised,) endeavoured to bring a new inquisition into the churches, and one by no means to be endured, obtained, that the same persons should be forbidden any more to demand this declaration from the Remonstrants: and moreover, that it should at the same time be enjoined on them, to explain more at large in writing, their counsel on the best way of peace, and concerning the conditions, by which they thought that a toleration should be circumscribed. When this had been done by them, and it had also been shewn, that the proposed *theses* concerning which a declaration had been demanded, were extant, in so many words, in the Confession and Catechism of the Belgick churches; and the *antitheses* themselves had been delivered in publick writings, by many persons, with whom the Remonstrants had much communication, in these regions:* when this their writing had been publickly read, they (the Remonstrants) by their advocate effected that it should be severely forbidden, to be communicated to any of the human race, either in printing, or as

* Mosheim and many (indeed *most*) other writers on the subject, represent the Contra-Remonstrants, as aiming to impose the creed of Geneva, or of Calvin, on the Remonstrants in Belgium. Let the impartial reader judge whether this was the real case. There might be, and indeed was some coincidence between this and the Confession and Catechism of the Belgick churches, but the latter exclusively are mentionedin the whole contest.

written by the hand of any one. And because they saw, that the deputies of the churches, or of the Synods, to whom the common cause of these concerns used to be committed, greatly withstood them, (as the nature of their office demanded,) they caused also, that, as before all the annual Synods had been hindered, so that it should likewise be forbidden to the same persons, henceforth to use the name, or perform the office, of a *deputy* of the churches or of a Synod. That, by this means, all care respecting the safety and peace of the churches being taken away, they (the Remonstrants) might so much the more freely make progress among them.*

By this method of acting, the Remonstrants rendered themselves more and more suspected by the churches; while all the more prudent men judged that, unless they dissented in these articles (the six stated above, p. 70, 71.) from the doctrine of the churches, they would have had no reason, why they should covertly flee from this declaration; especially when they might have (thus) promoted (*consuli posset*) the peace of the churches and their own credit. But that they might the more easily obtain that toleration by publick authority which they always pressed; by the benefit of which they indeed hoped to be able by little and little, to introduce their own doctrine in the churches, they employed this artifice; they

* These decrees were made by the States of Holland alone, or nearly; and they directly tended to disannul the code of laws of the federated provinces, promulged by the States General of these provinces, and thus to dissolve their political, as well as religious union. Now what motives could the Remonstrants or their patrons have, in such circumstances, for so carefully concealing the statements and avowed sentiments of the other pastors? Impartial love of the truth could not possibly suggest such precautions and injunctions. They cannot but call to our recollection, the conduct of the Jewish priests and rulers respecting the apostles of Christ: "But that it spread no further among the people, "let us straitly threaten them, that they speak to no man in this name." (Acts iv. 16, 17.)

sent over into England, by Hugo Grotius, a certain writing, in which the true state of the controversy was dissembled, a copy of a letter being also annexed; and they requested, that he would petition from the most Serene James, King of Great Britain, seeing this cause could not be settled by any other method than by a toleration, that his most Serene royal Majesty would deign to give letters according to the form of the annexed copy, to the Illustrious the High Mightinesses the States General; which he, (Grotius) having seized on an opportunity, surreptitiously obtained, and transmitted them to the Illustrious the States General.*

On this occasion, the Remonstrants exulted after a wonderful manner, and, hoping that they might now become possessed of their wish, they laboured by their advocate, that a certain formular of a toleration, (the same indeed which is contained in the fourth and fifth articles of the second chapter of the ecclesiastical government of Utrecht,) should be confirmed by the authority of the Illustrious the States, and commanded to the churches. Though the minds of many, in the convention of the States were inclined to this, yet the more prudent strenuously opposed it; thinking it to be unjust, to command (authoritatively) on the churches, a toleration, as to articles of faith, which had never been duly examined in a lawful ecclesiastical convention, and which drew with them a manifest change in doctrine; neither could the peace of the churches be obtained by this, when it was to be feared, if it were permitted, that opinions so discordant, should be proposed from the same pulpit to the same congregations, that the churches should be more

* It should be noted, that this narrative was published several years before the death of James; who therefore, it must be presumed, was willing to have it thought that these letters were surreptitiously obtained by Grotius: and indeed he seems to have been enveigled into a measure, by no means consistent with the part which he afterwards sustained in the controversy.

and more disturbed, as experience had hitherto taught.* Yet the Remonstrants went on to press this their toleration by every means, and to commend it privately and publickly in their writings and sermons; especially by this argument, that the articles, concerning which the controversy was maintained, they said, were of so small importance, that they did not relate to the ground or fundamental points of salvation; but in articles of this kind, toleration might and ought to be established.

July 25, 1614.] And thus they at length effected, that a decree concerning this toleration, some of the principal and powerful cities of Holland and West Friezland being unwilling and striving against it, should be published in print, confirmed with certain testimonies of scripture and of the fathers (among whom they had also brought forward Faustus Regiensiensis, the leader of the Semi-Pelagians). Against which things, when James Triglandius, a pastor of the church at Amsterdam, had answered in a publick writing, Utenbogardus also prolixly attempted a defence of this decree. In this he, by unworthy methods, traduced and

* Let it be recollected, that all the parties were *professedly*, and many of them, *in judgment and conscience*, strict presbyterians as to church-government. The toleration, here described, is entirely different from any thing known in Britain, or indeed at present thought of. The general sentiment even of those who claim not only the fullest toleration, but something beyond toleration, as their indisputable right, is, at least, 'Separate places of worship for those of discordant opinions.' The ground of the toleration here stated likewise, is widely different from that which is at present insisted on; namely, that in matters of conscience towards God, no human authority has a right to interfere, provided nothing be avowed or done, which threatens or disturbs the peace of the community; and that human authority can make only hypocrites, not willing and conscientious conformists. This is simple, intelligible, and evidently reasonable; but to tolerate *exclusively* opinions, which do not relate to *the fundamentals of salvation*, or militate against them, must make way for intricate and endless disputes and difficulties, about what are and what are not the fundamentals of salvation; what is tolerated, and what is not tolerated.

reviled, as well the doctrine of the reformed churches, as especially the lights of the same, Calvin, Beza, Zanchius, and others. To this writing Triglandius opposed an accurate answer, in defence of the honour, both of the doctrine and the doctors of the reformed churches. And when they (the Remonstrants) saw, that the authority of this writing, to which they had given the name of a decree of the States, was not so great, as that by it they could attain to what they aimed at, they indicated that the same things must be attempted in another way; and for that purpose, a certain other formular of toleration having been devised in deceitful phrases, they, by the hands of certain persons, who secretly favoured their party and opinions, but were not considered as Remonstrants, solicited from the pastors, subscription to this formular, every where throughout Holland, both privately and in their convention.

But when even in this way the business did not go on according to the purpose of their own mind; they judged, that those persons must be compelled (*cogendos*) by the authority of the superiors, whom they were not able to persuade to this, and that at length sometime it must be broken through, and this business evidently accomplished. To this end they likewise obtained, that in the name of the Illustrious the States, the decree concerning mutual toleration, which had been published in the former year, should be sent to each of the Classes, and at the same time it should be enjoined on the pastors to obey the same without any contradiction. And that they might the more easily prefer those, who were attached to their party, to the ministries of the churches, others having been excluded; they effected moreover that another (decree) should be joined to it, by which it was permitted, that in the vocation of pastors and elders, it should be allowable to use that order, which in the year 1591 had been framed, but not approved; from

the prescribed rule, of which the election was appointed to be by four of the magistracy, and four others to be deputed from the presbytery. When these decrees had been transmitted to the Classes, the most of them sent away their deputies to the Illustrious the States, that they might publickly explain their difficulties or grievances, which they had as to those things, that were contained in the writing; and might deprecate the introduction of the same. When on this account they had come to the Hague, and had now learned from the delegates of the principal cities, that those decrees, though they had already been transmitted, had not as yet been confirmed by the customary (*solemi*) approbation of all the States; and therefore could not as yet obtain the force of a law; they judged, that they must desist from the design till they should be further pressed. But this last decree gave occasion to new contentions and disturbances in many places, especially in the church at Harlem. For when some magistrates determined, that ministers should be called, according to this new form, and (thus) called them, but the churches did not approve it; it came to pass, that they refused to acknowledge those who had been thus called as their lawful pastors, and to have any ecclesiastical communion with them. It was also effected by these decrees, that certain classes in Holland, which had hitherto preserved unity, in the government of the churches, with the Remonstrants for the sake of peace, were now torn away from them (*divellerentur*), because the most of the pastors could not approve these things: yet as the Remonstrants purposed that the churches should be governed according to the prescript and law of these decrees, but were not able to extort this from their fellow ministers by authority, they introduced into the conventions of the Classes certain political persons, mostly alienated from the reformed religion, and attached to their party, and brought dominion into the churches.

For the orthodox pastors, tired out by the contentions which from these causes daily arose with the Remonstrants, judged it to be better, to meet together apart without them, and to take care of their own churches in peace, than to be wearied with their perpetual contentions.

In the mean time Utenbogardus procured, that it should be enjoined on his colleagues, by the authority of the superiors, to obey these decrees also; which when his colleague Henry Rosæus said that he could not promise with a good conscience; he was suspended from his office of teaching by the authority of the same persons, and by the sinister instigation of Utenbogardus.* Thence the members of the church at the Hague, who loved the purity (*sinceritatem*) of the reformed doctrine, continued the exercise of their religion; at first indeed in the neighbouring village of Risverch, but, when the pastors had obtained it by loan from the other churches at the Hague, in a separate place of worship (*templo*) to which afterwards some of the chief persons out of the States themselves, and the counsellors of the courts, and the other colleagues, and the most Illustrious the Prince of Orange himself, and the most Generous Count William Ludovicus, leaving the assemblies of the Remonstrants, resorted, that they might testify their consent to the orthodox doctrine, and their strong attachment to the same. The Remonstrants odiously traduced this separation under the title of SCHISM,† and endeavoured by all methods to hinder or to punish it: labouring in the mean while, that these decrees should be authoritatively put in execution in every place, where they knew that the magistrate favoured

* Whatever pretensions were made to toleration by the Remonstrants, it is from this most evident, that they paid no due regard to the rights of conscience, the proper ground of all toleration.

† It commenced nearly as most other schisms have done; but all the blame did not rest on those stigmatized as *schismaticks*, nor even the greatest measure of it.

them. On which account, when many pious men were punished by fines, prisons, and banishments, they appealed to the supreme tribunal of justice, and implored assistance against force; and when now the most ample the Senators of the supreme court attempted to succour the oppressed, they (the Remonstrants) obtained by the advocate of Holland, that an interdict should be laid on the same court, from protecting them.*

March A. D. 1616.] But when many also and principal cities of Holland, and in the first place among them the most powerful city of Amsterdam, opposed the execution of these decrees, it was effected that Hugo Grotius with certain persons should be sent to Amsterdam, in order that by his eloquence he might persuade the most ample the Senate of that city to approve the same decrees. When he had attempted this with a prolix oration, it was answered by the most ample the Senate; That they could by no means approve that, passing by the lawful synodical conventions, it should be deliberated in a convention of the States, concerning ecclesiastical affairs, that decrees should be made, and the execution of those decrees enjoined by authority: That it was purposed by them, that the true *Christian* religion, the exercise of which had flourished during fifty years in these regions, should be preserved; they judged also that even the least change would be pernicious to the republick, unless it had been first maturely examined by a lawful Synod; and further, they could not assent to the different propositions and acts made from the year 1611, even to the eighteenth of March of this year 1616, nor to this last proposition; neither were they willing,

* What must the modern advocates for toleration, and more than toleration, think of that toleration which these men pleaded for, while thus employed in persecution; and who have rendered their opponents odious even to this day, as enemies to toleration, for rejecting their illegal measures!

that under the name of the city of Amsterdam, (when it was no feeble member of that convention of the States,) any decrees should be established, much less authoritatively carried into execution, or any thing decreed against those who professed the reformed religion, unless controversies, and changes in religion, and in ecclesiastical affairs, had been first examined and discussed in lawful Synods, by the authority of the Illustrious the States. But neither were they willing, that pastors who were attached to the opinion of the reformed religion defended by the Contra-Remonstrants, should in the mean time on that account, either be suspended or removed from their ministerial offices; because they declared that they could not conscientiously cultivate ecclesiastical unity with the Remonstrants: neither that the churches which followed the same opinion, should, under the pretext of *Schism*, or because according to conscience, they were reluctant to attend on the sermons of the Remonstrants, be hindered in the exercise of divine worship. And all these things they determined, until by the authority of the Illustrious the States, a lawful Synod should be convened, in which these controversies might be duly examined and discussed. Thus the labour and endeavour of the Remonstrants, and of those who favoured them, were in vain; especially because the magistrates of the most ample city of Dort, of Enchuse, of Edamen, and of Purmerend, publickly approved this determination of the Senate of Amsterdam.*

About this time, the pastors of Camp in Transisulania, having embraced the opinion of the Remonstrants, by the assistance of the magistracy, cast out of the ministry their most

* As no intimation is here given of molesting the Remonstrants, either pastors or churches, but merely of preventing the Contra-Remonstrants from being molested, till a Synod were held; this decision of the Senate of Amsterdam, contains more of the spirit of toleration, than any thing which we have yet met with.

learned colleague, and most tenacious of sound doctrine William Stephanus, because he opposed their attempts; and by pamphlets published, and by publick sermons full of calumnies, they endeavoured to bring the reformed religion into the hatred of the common people.

March, A. D. 1617.] When, on account of these innovations in doctrine, and the disturbances of the churches, and of the state which followed, they saw that they were rendered more and more odious; they presented a second Remonstrance to the Illustrious the States, in which, with incredible impudence, they endeavour to remove from themselves the crime of innovation, and to fasten the same on those pastors, who most constantly remained in the received doctrine of these churches.* And the rest of the pastors presented likewise to the Illustrious the States a copious and solid answer to it. But, whereas these long continued controversies had already brought not into the churches only, but the republick likewise, so great a mass of difficulties, perturbations, and confusions, that all who loved the safety of the federated provinces, or of the reformed churches which are in them, or who favoured the same, understood, that the remedy of these evils could no longer be deferred without the manifest danger of the state and of the churches; and yet the Illustrious the States had not been able hitherto to agree as to the kind of remedy: James I. the most powerful and Serene king of Great Britain, out of his singular and sincere affection towards these regions and churches, thought, that the Illustrious and most powerful the States

* Either this whole narrative is false throughout, or this attempt was made with consummate effrontery: not indeed *incredible*, because other innovators, both ancient and modern, have endeavoured, and with success, to fasten the charge of innovation on those, who most steadily abode by the doctrine of articles, &c, subscribed by all parties. But nothing is *incredible*, of which several undeniable instances may be adduced.

General should be admonished by letters, no longer to suffer this gangrene to feed upon the body of the republick: but that they should, as soon as possible, proceed to meet these unhappy contentions, divisions, schisms, and factions, which threatened manifest danger to the state. And at the same time he obtested them, that they would restore to its original purity, all errors having been extirpated, the true and ancient reformed doctrine, which they had always professed, which had been confirmed by the common consent of all the reformed churches, and which had been always the foundation and bond of that most strict friendship and conjunction, which had so long flourished between his kingdoms and these provinces; and which he judged, might be done, of all means the most advantageously, by a national Synod, to be called together by their authority. For indeed this was the ordinary, legitimate, and most efficacious remedy, which had been had recourse to in every age, in evils of this kind among Christians. But moreover the most Illustrious Maurice, prince of Orange, the governor of federated Belgium, as often before this, so now did not desist daily, in a most solemn and weighty manner, to obtest, as well the Illustrious and most powerful the States General, and also the Illustrious the States of Holland and West Friezland, that in proportion as the safety of the republick and the churches was dear to them, so they would give diligent endeavours, that a remedy as soon as possible might be applied to these most grievous evils. For this purpose he also commanded, and pressed upon them, the convocation of a national Synod, as the most ordinary and the safest remedy.

The Illustrious the States of Zeland also, by the most noble and ample men, D. Maldersæus, Brouwerus, Potterus, and Bonifacius Junius, solemnly warned and intreated the Illustrious the orders of Holland and West Friezland, in their convention, that, seeing the contentions and dissentions

grew more and more grievous every day, with the greatest danger of the republick; and many remedies had hitherto been tried in vain; that they would agree to the convoking of a national Synod, as the ordinary remedy, proposed by the Holy Spirit for evils of this kind, and always had recourse to by Christians.* Then likewise the Illustrious the States of Gueldria, Friezland, Groningen, and Omlandia, requested the like thing by their deputies of the same the Illustrious the States (General).

But when the Remonstrants saw, that the convoking of a national Synod was recommended with so great earnestness by kings and princes, and the neighbouring and federated republicks, yea, and also by the principal cities of Holland and West Friezland; and when they feared lest the States of Holland and West Friezland, of whom many of their own accord inclined to it, and promoted this business diligently, should at length be moved to this consent; and so, that at some time, an account must be rendered of their doctrine and actions before the ecclesiastical tribunals; in order to avoid this, they at first proposed a new way of settling the controversies: namely, that a few persons, both

* It has, I believe, been generally supposed, that the Synod of Dort was convened by a faction or party, and for party ends and purposes; but it seems undeniable, that it became the general and almost universal opinion of the different States in the confederated provinces, that such a national Synod, as the Contra-Remonstrants always had urgently requested, was become absolutely and indispensably needful; and that the Remonstrants and their party could no longer resist this generally prevailing sentiment. Indeed nothing can be more clear, than that all parties, except the zealous Remonstrants, regarded a national Synod as the proper and only effectual way of terminating the controversial disturbances; and not only sanctioned by the example of Christians in every age, but enjoined by God himself. How far they were warranted in this sentiment, constitutes a distinct question. The Synod of Dort however should not be judged by our modern opinions, but by the general opinion of that age. The reasons why the Remonstrants dissented from that opinion are very evident.

political and ecclesiastical, of a certain and equal number, should be chosen by the Illustrious the States of Holland and West Friezland, who, having communicated counsels with each other, might devise some method of peace and concord, which, having been approved by the Illustrious the States, might then be prescribed to the churches. But when this did not succeed, (because, the more prudent easily foresaw, from whom, and of what kind of persons, this convention would be instituted, and what was to be expected from it; and besides, that it was unprecedented in the churches, and very little suited for taking away ecclesiastical controversies in things pertaining to doctrine,) they thought that the most extreme measures must be tried, rather than be reduced to this necessity; and accordingly recourse was had to the most desperate counsels. For some of the chief persons (or nobles, *proceribus*) were persuaded by them, that the calling of a national Synod, which was then pleaded for, was adverse to the majesty and liberty of the provinces: for that each province possessed the supreme right of determining about religion, as it should seem good to it: that it was an unworthy thing to subject this their liberty to the judgment of other provinces; (and) that this right of majesty was to be defended by all means, even by arms. By these and similar arguments, the minds of the more imprudent were so stirred up, that the rulers of some cities, having made a conspiracy, decreed to levy soldiers, who should be bound by oath, neither to the most powerful the States General, nor to the Illustrious the Prince of Orange, the Commander in chief of the army, but to themselves alone, for the defence of the cause of the Remonstrants, and of their own authority; which for the sake of the same (cause) they had exposed to danger. This was done at Utrecht, in which city the most powerful the States General had a garrison sufficiently strong against tumults and

seditions; at Harlem, Leyda, Rotterdam, as also Gouda, Schookhove, Horn, and other places; the Remonstrants instigating the magistrates of the cities to this, as may be clearly proved by divers of their letters, which afterwards came into (the) hands (of the States.) And thus the dissentions of the Remonstrants would have brought these flourishing provinces into the danger of a civil war, if this madness had not been early repressed, by the singular prudence of the most powerful the States General, and by the vigilance and fortitude of mind, never to be sufficiently celebrated (*depredicanda*) of the Illustrious the Prince of Orange.*

The most powerful the States General, when they saw, that by this method, the provinces were brought into extreme danger, judged, that the calling of a national Synod must no longer be delayed, but be hastened at the earliest opportunity; especially when that most Illustrious man, Dudley Carleton, the ambassador of the most Serene King of Great Britain, by a very weighty and prudent speech, had earnestly stirred up their Illustrious Highnesses to the same. This oration the Remonstrants afterwards were not afraid publickly to revile, in a most impudent and most calumniating pamphlet, to which they gave the title of *Bilancis;* sparing with a slanderous tongue no order of men, not the most powerful the States, not the Prince of Orange, yea, not even the most Serene the King of Great Britain. This pamphlet, the most powerful the States General condemned by a publick

* How far the subsequent proceedings against the Remonstrants, are to be considered simply as religious persecution, may well be questioned, when such seditious, if not treasonable practices, were proved against them from their own letters. It seems evident from this history, that recourse to arms, in the first instance at least, was had by the party of the Remonstrants, and in opposition to existing laws. This is not generally understood. The rights of conscience, and the toleration arising from the recognition of it, seem to have been equally unthought of by both parties.

edict as scandalous and seditious; having offered a most ample reward, if any one could point out the author. Afterwards Jo. Casimirus Junius, the son of the most celebrated Francis Junius, not unlike his father, (*haud degener*,) copiously refuted the same. Therefore the Illustrious and most powerful the States, decreed the convoking of a national Synod, at length in the name of the Lord, to be held on the first day of May in the following year; and at the same time, they enacted some laws, according to which they willed as well that the convocation should be instituted, as the Synod itself held. But because the Remonstrants did not appear greatly to regard the judgment of the Belgick churches, and had always endeavoured to persuade the people, that they did not dissent from the opinion of the reformed churches; it seemed good also, to their Illustrious Mightinesses, to invite, from all the reformed churches of the neighbouring kingdoms, principalities, and republicks, some theologians, distinguished for piety, learning, and prudence, that they might support by their judgments and counsels the deputies of the Belgick churches; and that so these controversies, having been examined and throughly discussed, as it were by the common judgment of all the reformed churches, might be composed so much the more certainly, happily, safely, and with the greater benefit.

Dec. 11, 1617.] This decree having been made, the Remonstrants began in a wonderful manner to make disturbances, and proposed various other projects (*conceptibus*) by those who were attached to their cause, in endeavouring to overturn it and render it of no effect: in Holland indeed, they themselves, by their favourers, demanded a provincial Synod, against which a little while ago they had entertained so strong an aversion (*tantopere abhorruerant*). And because measures had been devised for calling foreign theologians to the national Synod, they thought that to this provincial

Synod, if so it seemed good, some foreign theologians might be (invited). But it was answered, that indeed a provincial Synod had formerly been demanded by the churches of Holland, when no hope appeared of obtaining a national Synod, and when the controversies were confined within the boundaries of the churches of Holland alone: but now, because the calling of a national Synod had been decreed, and the evil had diffused itself through all the provinces, so that it could not be taken away by the Synod of one province, it was at this time altogether unreasonable to think of a provincial Synod, for the composing of these controversies. Because, in like manner, as it behoved particular Synods, in each of the provinces, to precede the national Synod; so in Holland also, both North and South (Holland) particular Synods would precede. Yet the Remonstrants, by their favourers, pressed eagerly and urged such a Synod: either, because they thought, that it would less obstruct their cause, as they had in Holland so many great men and even pastors favouring them; or that they might by this tergiversation absolutely hinder the calling of the national Synod. But when they themselves saw, that this demand was too unjust for them easily to persuade (the granting of) it; they fled to a new exception, and desired (or proposed) that this cause should be deferred, (or reserved) to a general council (*œcumenicam*). But it was answered them, That it was most uncertain, whether or when a general council could be called; yet that these evils required a present remedy, and that this national (Synod) about to be called by the Illustrious and most powerful the States General, would be as it were an œcumenical and general (council); when deputies from almost all the reformed churches would be present at the same. If they should account themselves aggrieved by the judgment of such a Synod, it would always be entire and lawful to them to appeal from this national to a ge-

neral council; provided only, that in the mean time they obeyed the judgment of the national Synod. By these evasions and subterfuges they effected, that the letters of convocation were for some little time delayed; and it was necessary that the day appointed for the meeting should be changed and deferred.*

In the mean while that most Illustrious person, Dudley Carleton, in the convention of the Illustrious and most powerful the States General, publickly complained, that the honour of his master, the most Serene the King of Great Britain, had been very unworthily and impudently reviled, in the infamous libel (or pamphlet) *Bilancis*, which the Remonstrants, even after the edict of their Highnesses, had taken care should be printed again, having been translated into the French language: and having briefly and solidly refuted most of the objections of the Remonstrants, he explained to the Illustrious and most powerful the States General, what method the most powerful King of Great Britain was accustomed to employ, in settling controversies concerning religion or doctrine; which, because it agreed with the decree of the Illustrious the States General, it more and more confirmed their Illustrious Highnesses in this holy determination. The most ample also the Magistracy of the city of Amsterdam, having communicated counsel previously with the pastors of that church, and others called together for this cause, propounded in writing many and very weighty reasons, in the convention of the Illustrious the States of Holland and West Friezland, in which it was most evidently demonstrated, that these controversies could not be determined at this season

* The conduct of the Remonstrants, on this occasion, evidently resembled that of an accused person, who, instead of demanding a fair trial, objects to the authority of the court, challenges the jurymen, and endeavours to find out flaws in the indictment, and adopts every evasion to escape the trial, which can be suggested by his solicitor or counsel.

by any other method, than by a national Synod; at the same time they most solidly answered all the objections of the Remonstrants, and all their projects, concerning a provincial Synod, and also concerning a general council. Soon after likewise the most ample the Magistracy of the city of Enchusen, having exhibited many reasons, in writing also, approved the same. These reasons were afterwards made publick; that it might be evident to all men, how unjustly the Remonstrants and their favourers acted, because they obstinately resisted the calling of a national Synod, by these new projects, and eluded (*subterfugerent*) its decision.

The Illustrious the States General, as they judged that this thing so entirely necessary, and for the most just and weighty causes already decreed, was not to be any longer delayed, on account of projects and shiftings of this kind; again decreed, that the convocation of a national Synod, without any delay or adjournment, should be immediately instituted; and they determine, that the city Dordrecht (or Dort) should be the place of its meeting; the day, the first of the next November. When some persons among the States of Holland and West Friezland, favouring the cause of the Remonstrants, opposed themselves to this decree, in the convention of the Illustrious and most powerful the States General, who complained, that an injury was done to the majesty, the right, and finally, the liberty of that province; the Illustrious and most powerful the States General, declared by publick letters, that they did not purpose, by this convocation of a national Synod, that any thing should be taken away from, or lessened in the majesty, right, or liberty, of any province; but that this was the sincere intention of their Highnesses, that without any prejudice of any province, and even of the union and confederation, by the ordinary decision of a national Synod, the ecclesiastical controversies alone that had arisen concerning doctrine, which

pertained to all the reformed Belgick churches, should lawfully be determined to the glory of God, and the peace of the republick and of the churches. They then addressed letters to the States of each of the provinces, in which they declared, that it had been determined by them, to call together, in the name of the Lord, from all the churches of these provinces a national Synod, on the first of November ensuing; that by this method the controversies which had arisen in the same churches, might be lawfully examined and settled in a beneficial manner, (truth being always preserved). At the same time they admonished them, that as soon as they could, they would call a provincial Synod in their own provinces, after the accustomed manner; from which six pious and learned men, and greatly loving peace; namely, three or four pastors, with two or three other proper persons, professing the reformed religion, might be deputed, who in the aforementioned national Synod, according to the laws constituted by them, (a copy of which they transmitted,) might examine those controversies and take them away, truth being preserved, (or safe, *salva veritate*). To the Gallo-Belgick churches also (of French Flanders), which used to constitute a peculiar Synod among themselves, seeing they had been dispersed through all these provinces, they addressed letters of the same kind. These letters having been received, the Illustrious the States of each of the provinces, called together the provincial or particular Synods of their own churches; in which the grievances might be proposed which were to be carried to the national Synod, the persons to be sent out to the same be deputed, and the commands with which these were to be furnished, framed by the common suffrages of the churches. These things were transacted in each of the provinces, in the manner hitherto in use in these reformed churches; except that in Holland and in the province of Utrecht, because of the very great

number of the Remonstrants, the customary method could not in all things be observed. For when in Holland separations had been made in some of the Classes, so that the Remonstrants held their own Class-meetings apart, and the other pastors their's also; it seemed proper to the most Illustrious the States of that province, that of the Classes, in which a separation of this kind had not been made, four should be deputed by the majority of votes, in the manner hitherto customary, who with the ordinary power might be sent forth to the particular Synod; but in the other Classes, for the sake of avoiding confusion, the Remonstrants should appoint two, and the other pastors in like manner two, who might be sent with equal power to the particular Synod. In the province of Utrecht, the churches had not been distributed into certain Classes: wherefore it pleased the most Illustrious the States of that province, that all the Remonstrants should meet together apart in one Synod; but the rest of the pastors, who did not follow the opinion of the Remonstrants, of whom there still remained no small number, in another (Synod); and that from each Synod and party, three should be sent forth to the national Synod with the power of judging. But the church of Utrecht, as it had been torn asunder into parties, of which the one followed the opinion of the Remonstrants, but the other disapproved of it; and this (party) recently set at liberty from the oppression of the Remonstrants, had not made provision for stated pastors, but used at that time the ministry of John Dipetzius, a pastor of Dort; it so happened that he was lawfully deputed by another Synod, in the name of the churches of Utrecht, which did not follow the opinion of the Remonstrants. But when the Synod of the churches of Gueldria and Zutphan, had been assembled at Arnhem, the Remonstrant deputies from the Class of Bommellien refused to sit along with the rest, unless previously certain con-

ditions had been performed to them, which the Synod judged to be opposed to the decree of the Illustrious the States. And when ten articles had before this been offered by the Remonstrants of the Class of Neomage, Bommelli, and Tiel, to the Illustrious the States of Gueldria, and to the counsellors of the same, which they intimated to be taught by the rest of the pastors; it had been enjoined on them, that they should publickly name those pastors who taught these things, in order that they might be cited before the Synod, that it might in a legal manner be examined, whether the matter were so indeed. For it was evident (*constabat*) that those articles had been framed by the Remonstrants in a calumniating manner, in order to excite odium (*ad conflandam invidiam*) against the rest of the pastors, before the Supreme magistracy. But they were not able to name any one in that whole province, except the pastor of Hattemis, who had abundantly cleared himself to the Class; and when the Synod nevertheless was willing to cite him, that he might be heard before them, the Remonstrants no further pressed it. Certainly Henry Arnoldi, a pastor of Delph, who was present in the name of the churches of South Holland, declared that there was no one in South Holland who approved or taught these things.* Therefore the Synod severely reproved them for these atrocious calumnies; and at the same time declared, that the churches of Gueldria did not embrace or approve the doctrine contained in these articles, as it was set forth by them: though there were in them some sentences,

* In like manner it is at this day confidently asserted by writers, who, on one account or another, are regarded as worthy of credit; and thus it is generally believed, that there are a numerous set of men in Britain, called Calvinists, or Methodists, or evangelical preachers, who preach doctrines, defined and stated by the writers, and justly deemed absurd and pernicious; who, if they were thus authoritatively called on to prove their assertions, would scarcely be able to substantiate the charge on one individual of the whole company.

which, taken apart, and in an accommodating sense, could not be disapproved. Then at length, having confessed the crime of a calumny into which they had been driven (*impactæ calumniæ*), they requested forgiveness of it (*eam deprecati sunt*). There was then drawn up in the same Synod, a state of the controversy between the Remonstrants and the rest of the pastors, which afterwards was exhibited to the national Synod. And as there were many pastors in that province, of whom some had been suspected of various other errors besides the five articles of the Remonstrants, others had illegally intruded into the ministry, and finally others were of profligate life: some of them having been cited before the Synod, for these causes were suspended from the ministry; but by no means because of the opinion contained in the five articles of the Remonstrants, which were reserved to the national Synod. The cause of the rest, having been left in the name of the Synod, was referred to some persons deputed by it, to whom the Illustrious the States likewise joined their own delegates. These causes, having been fully examined in their Classes, they suspended certain of them from their ministry, and others they entirely removed.

In the mean while the Illustrious the States General, when they had several times commanded those of Utrecht especially, to dismiss the new soldiers, and those who, it appeared, had been levied for this purpose also, that the execution of the decrees of the future national Synod, if perhaps the Remonstrants could not approve of them, might be hindered by an armed force; determined that all these soldiers, of which there were now some thousands, should, as soon as possible, be disbanded and discharged by their authority. And when this measure had been carried into effect by the most Illustrious the Prince of Orange, with incredible fortitude of soul, prudence, dexterity, and promptitude, without any effusion of blood; and their principal

officers, who had endeavoured by force to resist this disbanding of them, had been committed to custody; *John* Utenbogardus, James Taurinus, and Adolphus Venator, conscious in themselves of criminality, (*male sibi conscii*), having deserted their churches, fled out of federated Belgium; as likewise did a short time after Nicolas Grevinchovius, having been cited by the court of Holland to plead his own cause. And when a particular Synod in South Holland had been called at Delph, most of the Remonstrants, despising the before mentioned decree of the Illustrious the States, refused to depute any person to the Synod; and, having presented a little suppliant book (*libello supplicæ*) to the Illustrious the States of Holland and West Friezland, they petitioned that, instead of the national Synod now proclaimed, another convention instituted according to the same twelve conditions, which those who were cited afterwards laid before the national Synod, might be called. The Illustrious the States, having heard the judgment of the Synod of Delph concerning this demand, (which also was inserted in these acts,) commanded them to obey the constituted order, and the mandates of the Illustrious the States; and moreover, fully to state their opinion comprised in writing, concerning the articles proposed in the conference at Delph, in the year 1613; and to add all their considerations, which they had respecting the Confession and Catechism of these churches. They exhibited the declaration of their opinion on the before mentioned articles, which afterwards, having been translated into Latin by the delegates of this Synod, was communicated to the national Synod: but, in the place of considerations, they sent some things gathered out of the writings of certain learned men, as if opposite to the Confession and the Catechism.

Before this Synod, John Utenbogardus, and Nicolas Grevinchovius were cited; and when the former, as a fugitive

(*profugus*), dared not to appear, but the latter contumaciously refused, the accusations produced against them having been examined, each of them was, by the judgment of this Synod, removed from the ecclesiastical ministry. But when in South Holland, besides these two, there were many others, of whom the most, in these dissentions, had been obtruded on unwilling churches, without a lawful vocation; and others, who besides these five articles, had moreover scattered many Socinian errors, others had grievously offended the churches by wicked and turbulent actions, and others finally led a profane life; it was judged necessary, in order that the churches should be purified from these scandals, and the discipline of the clergy as it is called, which had fallen into decay, should at length be restored, that all these disorderly (ἀτάκτους) pastors should be cited, that they might render before the Synod, an account, as well of their vocation, as of their doctrine, and also of their life; which seemed proper to be done, even for this cause also, before the national Synod, that if perhaps any should deem themselves aggrieved by the sentence of the Synod, or its deputies, they might appeal to the judgment (of the national Synod). Certain of these appeared, whose causes having been duly examined, some of them were suspended from their office, and other wholly set aside. But as to those, who because of the shortness of the time, having been cited, could not be heard, and those who, having been cited, had not appeared; five pastors were deputed, to whom the Illustrious the States joined also three deputies, who might take cognizance of their cause, and give sentence upon it in the name of the Synod. But it was expressly enjoined to these deputies, not to fix any censure on any one, because of the opinion expressed in the five articles of the Remonstrants; forasmuch, as the judgment concerning the same had been reserved entire to the national Synod. But

they, though they every where, on the afore mentioned most weighty causes, even during the national Synod, suspended many, partly from the office of teaching, and partly entirely set them aside; yet marked no one with any censure because of the opinion of the five articles, as it may be evidently shewn from their very Acts.* In North Holland, matters were conducted after the same method, in the Synod of Horn, in which the pastors of Horn, John Valesius, John Rodingenus, and Isaac Welsingius, having been suspended from the office of teaching, appealed to the national Synod. And when the deputies of this Synod, along with the delegates of the Illustrious the States, examined, in the Class of Alcmar, the cause of John Geystran, a pastor of Alcmar, and of Peter Geystran, his brother, a pastor of Egmond; it was detected, that they had been evidently addicted to the blasphemous and execrable errors of Socinus, as it appears from their own confession; which, because it was publickly read in the national Synod, with the horror of all men, is likewise inserted in these Acts. In the Synod of the Transisulanian churches, some of the Remonstrants were commanded to render an account of their doctrine and actions; and when among them four pastors of the church of Campe, Thomas Goswin, Assuerus Matthisius, John Scotlerus, and above all Everard Vosculius, had been accused of many errors, and of various turbulent actions; the cause having been examined, it seemed good to reserve it for the national Synod; even as it was afterwards brought before the same. In the other provinces, because no manifest Remonstrants were found, the Synods there held duly prepared all things with less labour, after the accustomed manner, for the national Synod.

* The appeal is thus made to the registered Acts of these deputies, evidently because they had been or were likely to be misrepresented by the favourers of the Remonstrants; as, beyond doubt, they generally have been to this very day.

In the mean time, the most Illustrious and powerful the States General had addressed letters to the most Serene and powerful James I. King of Great Britain, to the deputies of the reformed churches of the kingdom of France, to the most Serene the Elector Palatine, and the Elector of Brandenburg; to the most Illustrious the Landgrave of Hesse; to the four reformed republicks of Helvetia, (Switzerland,) the Tigurine, Bernessian, Basilian, and Schaphusian; to the Illustrious and generous the counts of Correspondentia and Wedevarica; to the republicks of Geneva, Bremen, and Emden, in which they requested, that they would deign to send from them to this Synod, some of their own theologians, excelling in learning, piety, and prudence, who might earnestly labour by their counsels and decisions, along with the rest of the deputies of the Belgick churches, to settle those controversies, which had arisen in these Belgick churches, and to restore peace to the same.

All these things having been duly prepared and completed, when at the appointed time as well the deputies of the Belgick churches, as also the foreign theologians, a few excepted, had met together at Dordrecht, (or Dort), that national Synod was begun in the name of the Lord, on the thirteenth day of November (1618). But in this Synod, what now was actually done, the prudent reader may copiously (*prolixè*) know from the Acts of the same, which now are published for the favour (satisfaction, *gratiam*) and use of the reformed churches. It hath seemed good also, that to these Acts should be joined, besides other writings exhibited to this Synod, the judgments also of the theologians, concerning the five articles of the Remonstrants as they were proposed in the Synod; by which they may more fully know, by the same, on what passages of Scripture, and on what arguments, the canons of the reformed church do rest. It is not to be doubted, but that the prudent reader

will discover in these judgments, the highest and most admirable agreement. If perhaps in less matters a certain diversity appear; even this will be an argument, that a due liberty of prophesying and judging flourished, in this venerable convention; but that all, notwithstanding, by concording opinions, agreed in the doctrine expressed in the canons of this Synod; of whom all and every one, (not one indeed excepted, or declining to do it,) subscribed to testify this consent.

But all the reformed churches are requested, willingly to embrace, preserve, and propagate this orthodox doctrine, so solemnly in this Synod, explained and confirmed from the word of God; and transmit it to all posterity, to the glory of divine grace, and the consolation and salvation of souls. And at the same time also favourably to receive the pious, and never sufficiently to be celebrated zeal and earnest endeavour of the most Illustrious and mighty the States General of federated Belgium, for preserving the purity (*sinceritate*) of the reformed religion; and also to follow up with their favour, the diligence and piety, in maintaining the same, of so many doctors, of distinguished churches, who were present at this Synod: and, above all things, it is requested, that they would earnestly intreat the most high and gracious God (*optimum maximum*) that he would indeed benignly preserve the Belgick churches, and, in like manner, all others professing with them the same orthodox doctrine, in the unity of the faith, in peace and tranquillity; and that he would inspire a better mind into the Remonstrants themselves, and all others who are involved in error;* and by the grace of his own Spirit, would at

* 'That it may please thee to bring into the way of truth, all such 'as have erred and are deceived.'—Litany. The Calvinism of the Synod did not, it seems, prevent their prayers for those who, as they supposed, were in error. It did not lead them to treat their most eager opponents, as *reprobates*, and give up as necessarily consigned to destruction;

length, some time lead them to the knowledge of the truth, to the glory of his own divine name, the edification of the churches, and the salvation of us all; through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; to whom with the Father, and the Holy Spirit, the one, true, and immortal God, be praise, and honour, and glory, for ever and ever. Amen.*

as many ignorantly suppose, or confidently assert, that decided Calvinists do, even with malignity and malignant satisfaction. So greatly are they calumniated!

* 'Accordingly a Synod was convoked at Dordrecht in the year 1618, 'by the counsels and influence of prince Maurice, &c.'—Mosheim, vol. v. p. 450. 'Our author always forgets to mention the order issued by 'the States General, for the convocation of this famous Synod; and by 'his manner of expressing himself, and particularly by the phrase, (*Mau-'ritio auctore,*) would seem to insinuate, that it was by this prince, 'that the assembly was called together. The legitimacy of the manner 'of convoking this Synod was questioned by Olden-Barneveldt, who 'maintained that the States General had no sort of authority in matters 'of religion; affirming that this was an act of sovereignty, that belonged 'to each province separately, and respectively.'—Maclaine, Ibid.

It was by means of these disputes, about the ecclesiastical authority, (which all parties supposed to be possessed by some of them,) that the union of the confederated States was endangered in this controversy.

'Dr. Mosheim, however impartial, seems to have consulted more 'the authors of one side than of the other, probably because they were 'more numerous, and more generally known. When he published this 'history, the world had not been favoured with *The Letters, Memoirs,* '*and Negociations* of Sir Dudley Carleton, which Lord Royston (after-'wards Earl of Hardwicke) drew from his inestimable treasure of his-'torical manuscripts, and presented to the public, or rather at first to 'a select number of persons, to whom he distributed a small number 'of copies, printed at his own expence. They were soon translated 'both into Dutch and French: and, though it cannot be affirmed, that 'the spirit of party is no where discoverable in them; yet they contain 'anecdotes with respect both to Olden-Barneveldt and Grotius, that the 'Arminians, and the other patrons of these two great men, have been 'studious to conceal. These anecdotes, though they may not be suf-'ficient to justify the severities exercised against these eminent men, 'would, however, have prevented Dr. Mosheim from saying, that he 'knew not on what pretext they were arrested.'—Mosheim, vol. v. p. 449, 450. Note by Maclaine.

In a political contest for authority, between prince Maurice, and his opponents, in the States General, the Remonstrants favoured his

opponents, and the Contra-Remonstrants were attached to *him*. The prince's party at length prevailed, and, 'the men who sat at the helm 'of government, were cast into prison. Olden-Barneveldt, a man of 'wisdom and gravity, whose hairs were grown grey in the service of 'his country, lost his life on the public scaffold, while Grotius and 'Hoogerberts were condemned to perpetual imprisonment; under what 'pretext, or in consequence of what accusations or crimes, is unknown 'to us.'—Mosheim, vol. v. p. 448, 449.

THE JUDGMENT

OF THE

National Synod of the Reformed Belgick Churches,

Held at Dort, in the Years of our Lord, 1618, 1619;

AT WHICH VERY MANY THEOLOGIANS OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES OF GREAT BRITAIN, GERMANY, AND FRANCE, WERE PRESENT; CONCERNING THE FIVE HEADS OF DOCTRINE CONTROVERTED IN THE BELGICK CHURCHES.

(Published on the fifth of May, A. D. 1619.)

PREFACE.

In the Name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

Among very many comforts, which our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ hath given to his own church militant, in this calamitous pilgrimage; that which he left unto it, when about to go away to his Father, into the heavenly sanctuary, saying, "I am with you at all times, even unto the end of "the world," is deservedly celebrated. The truth of this most delightful promise shines forth in the church of all ages, which, whilst it has been besieged from the beginning, not only by the open violence of enemies, but also by the secret craftiness of seducers, truly if at any time the Lord had deprived it of the salutary guard of his own promised presence, had long since been either crushed by the power of tyrants, or seduced into destruction by the fraud of impostors.

But that good Shepherd, who most constantly loveth his flock, for which he laid down his life, hath always, most

seasonably, and often by his own right hand stretched forth, most miraculously repressed the rage of persecutors; and hath also detected and dissipated the crooked ways of seducers, and their fraudulent counsels; by both demonstrating himself to be most effectually present (*presentissimum*) in his church. Of this thing, an illustrious instruction (*documentum*) exists in the history of the pious emperors, kings, and princes, whom the Son of God hath excited so often for the assistance of his church, hath fired with the holy zeal of his house, and by their help, hath not only repressed the furious rage (*furores*) of tyrants; but also hath procured to his church when conflicting with false teachers, in various ways adulterating religion, the remedies of holy Synods; in which the faithful servants of Christ, by united prayers, counsels, and labours, have valiantly stood for the church, and for the truth of God; have intrepidly opposed themselves against the "ministers of Satan, "though transforming themselves into angels of light;" have taken away the seeds of errors and discords; have preserved the church in the concord of pure religion; and have transmitted the genuine (*sincerum*) worship of God, uncorrupted, to posterity. With a similar benefit, our faithful Saviour hath, at this time, testified his own gracious presence with the Belgick church, by one means or other (*aliquam*) very much afflicted for many years. For this church, rescued by the powerful hand of God from the tyranny of the Roman antichrist, and the horrible idolatry of popery, (or the popedom, *papatus*,) and many times most miraculously preserved in the dangers of a long continued war; and flourishing in the concord of true doctrine and discipline, to the praise of her God, to an admirable increase of the republick and the joy of the whole reformed world, James (*Jacobus*) Arminius and his followers, holding out the name of Remonstrants, by various errors, old as well as new; at first

covertly, and then openly assaulted (*tentarunt*), and while it was pertinaciously disturbed with scandalous dissentions and schisms, they had brought it into such extreme danger, that, unless the mercy of our Saviour had most opportunely interposed in behalf of his most flourishing church, they had at length consumed it with the horrible conflagration of discords and schisms.

But, blessed be the Lord for ever, who, after he had hid his face for a moment from us, (who by many ways had provoked his wrath and indignation,) hath made it attested to the whole world, that he doth not forget his covenant, nor contemn the sighs of his own people. For when scarcely any hope of a remedy, humanly speaking (*humanitus*) appeared; he inspired this mind into the most Illustrious and very powerful the States General of confederated Belgium,* that, with the counsel and direction of the most Illustrious and valiant the Prince of Orange, they determined to go forth to meet these raging evils, by those legitimate means, which have been sanctioned by the examples of the apostles themselves, and of the Christian church that followed them, during a long course of years, and which have before this been had recourse to (*usurpatæ*) in the Belgick church, with much fruit; and they called a Synod at Dordrecht by their own authority, out of all the provinces which they governed; having sought out towards it both the favour of the most Serene and powerful James king of Great Britain, and of Illustrious Princes, Counts, and Republicks, and having obtained also very many most grave theologians; that, by common judgment of so many divines of the reformed church, those dogmas of Arminius and of his followers might be decided on accurately, and by the word of God alone; that the true doctrine might be confirmed, and the false rejected; and that concord, peace, and tranquillity

* See Ezra vii. 27, 28.

might, by the divine blessing, be restored to the Belgick churches. This is that benefit of God, in which the Belgick churches exult; and they humbly acknowledge and thankfully proclaim, the compassions of their faithful Saviour. Therefore this venerable Synod, (after a previous appointment and observance of prayers and fasting, by the authority of the Supreme Magistracy, in all the Belgick churches, to deprecate the wrath of God, and to implore his gracious assistance) being met together in the name of the Lord at Dordrecht, fired with the love of God (*divini numinis*) and for the salvation of the church; and, after having invoked the name of God, having bound itself by a sacred oath, that it would take the Holy Scriptures alone as the rule of judgment, and engage in the examination (*cognitione*) and decision of this cause, with a good and upright conscience, they attempted diligently, with great patience, to induce the principal patrons of those dogmas, being cited before them, to explain more fully their opinion, concerning the known five heads of doctrine, and the grounds (or reasons) of that opinion.

But when they rejected the decision of the Synod, and refused to answer to their interrogatories, in that manner which was equitable, and when neither the admonitions of the Synod, nor the mandates of the most honourable and ample the delegates of the States General; nor yet even the commands of the most Illustrious and very powerful lords the States General, availed any thing with them, (the Synod) was compelled, by the command of the same lords, to enter on another way; according to the custom received of old, in ancient Synods; and from writings, confessions, and declarations, partly before published, and partly even exhibited to this Synod, an examination of those five dogmas, (or points of doctrine,) was instituted. Which when it was now completed, by the singular grace of God, with the

greatest diligence, fidelity, and conscience (or conscientiousness) with the consent of all and every one; this Synod, for the glory of God, and that it might take counsel for the entireness *(integritate)* of the saving truth, and for the tranquillity of consciences, and for the peace and safety of the Belgick church, determined that the following judgment, by which both the true opinion, agreeing with the word of God, concerning the aforesaid five heads of doctrine is explained, and the false opinion, and that discordant with the word of God is rejected, should be promulgated.

On this preface, I would make a few remarks:

1. If the expectations, which the persons constituting this Synod, and of those who were concerned in convening it, as to the useful tendency and beneficial effects of such assemblies, were indeed ill grounded, and of course the measure improper; the fault was not exclusively their's, but that of the age in which they lived, and indeed of almost all preceding ages. Not one of the reformers, or of the princes who favoured the Reformation, can be named, who did not judge, either a general council, or national councils or Synods of some kind, proper measures for promoting the cause of truth and holiness, and counteracting the progress of schism, heresy, and false doctrine: and in every place, where the reformation was established, assemblies of the rulers and teachers of the church, under one form or other, were employed, either in framing, or sanctioning, the articles of faith, adopted in each church, and in regulating the several particulars respecting the doctrine to be preached, the worship to be performed by those who constituted each church, and the terms of officiating as ministers, in their respective societies. The system of independency, and *individuality*, so to speak,

either of separate congregations, or ministers, or Christians, without any such common bond of union or concert, had not then been thought of, at least in modern times. And at this day, while numbers suppose that they steer their course at a distance from the rocks which endangered the first reformers, as well as the whole church in former ages, it may well be questioned whether they do not run into the opposite extreme. Solomon says, or God himself by him, "In the multitude of "counsellors there is safety;" yet who does not know, that through the evil dispositions, and selfish conduct of those, who constitute the counsellors, and senates, and parliaments of different nations, such abuses often occur in them, as form a manifest exception to this general maxim? Yet who does not also see, that parliaments, and counsellors, and laws, are in themselves very desirable; and far preferable to every thing being settled by the sole will or caprice of every one, who by any means obtains authority? or, that every man should do that which is right in his own eyes, as when there was *no king* in Israel? The abuse alone is the evil, and to be guarded against: the thing itself is allowedly beneficial.

The apostles themselves, when consulted by Paul and Barnabas, did not settle the question proposed to them by their own direct authority: but "the apostles and elders "came together for to consider of this matter." (Acts xv. 6.) It is evident that some, even in 'that first *general* council,' as it is very improperly called, had strong prejudices against the measure which was finally decided on: yet its decrees proved a blessing of no small magnitude to the churches of Christ, whether constituted of Jewish or Gentile converts. Now, a measure thus sanctioned, cannot be *evil in itself:* though General councils and Synods should have in *many* or *most* instances, been productive of far greater evil than good. The fault lay in the motives, the corrupt passions, and wrong state of mind and heart of those who convened,

and of those who constituted them, (that is, in the abuse of the thing;) not in the thing itself.

The apostles by their own authority might have decreed the same things, and have said, "It seemed good to the Holy "Ghost and to us, &c:" but they were not led by the Spirit of inspiration, to adopt this method: they did nothing by *absolute* authority; it does not appear that any thing directly miraculous, or of immediate revelation, concurred in their decision. It was the result of arguments drawn from facts, and from the holy Scriptures, under the teaching of the Holy Spirit, not materially differing from what uninspired men, of the same character and heavenly "wisdom, without partiality "and without hypocrisy" might have formed, under the mere ordinary teaching and superintendence of the same Spirit. Now, it is not impossible for God to raise up elders and teachers, bearing this holy character, and endued with this heavenly wisdom, in other ages and nations, who, coming together to consider of those things which corrupt the doctrine, worship, and purity, or disturb the peace, of the church, may form and promulgate decisions, so evidently grounded on a fair interpretation of the sacred oracles, and so powerfully enforced by the character and influence of those concerned, as, by the divine blessing, may produce the most extensively beneficial effects.

General councils, so called, convened by the concurring authority of many princes and rulers, over rival nations, are not likely to come to any such scriptural decisions; and the history of general councils is certainly suited exceedingly to damp our expectations from them. But the history of the Reformation, both on the continent and in this land, produces many instances of conventions, under one name or other, in which the rulers and teachers of the church, under the countenance of princes who favoured the cause of truth and holiness; came to such decisions, in the most important matters,

as proved very extensive and permanent benefits to mankind, and which could not have been expected without united deliberations and determinations of this kind. The ministers and members of the establishment, in this land, at least, must be allowed to think that this was the case, in the framing of our articles, liturgy, and homilies.

It is true that afterwards, *convocations* became useless, or even worse than useless, and so sunk into disuse: but this was not until the spirit of wisdom and piety, which actuated our first Reformers, had most grievously declined, and made way for a political and party spirit, in the persons concerned. Thus the *abuse* of the measure, not the measure itself, must bear the blame.

2. I observe from this preface, that the members of the Synod of Dort, in the most solemn manner, and in the language at least of genuine piety, declare the awful obligations under which they brought themselves, to decide the controverted questions according to the holy scriptures alone, and their full consciousness that they had discharged this obligation in an upright manner. The names annexed to their decisions certainly include among them a great proportion, of the most able protestant and reformed theologians in Europe: and who can doubt the sincerity of these professions, when coming from such men as Bishops Davenant and Ward, and those with whom they thus cordially united?—Prejudices, mistakes, and faults of many kinds may be supposed in them; but the candid and pious mind recoils from the idea, that the whole was *direct and intended hypocrisy*.

In fact, I must give it as my opinion at least, that they did fulfil their solemn engagement; and must confess, that fewer things appear to me *unscriptural*, in these articles, than in almost any human composition which I have read upon the subject. Of course I expect that Anticalvinists will judge otherwise, and even many Calvinists: yet surely every

candid man will allow, that they honestly meant thus to decide, and thought that they had thus decided.

It may also be seen in the course of this work, that their doctrine accorded with the Belgick articles before in force among them, to which the Contra-Remonstrants had all along appealed.

3. I would observe, that they seem to have aimed at too much in their deliberations and decisions; not too much for an *ordinary controversial* publication, but too much for an *authoritative standard*, to be entirely received and adhered to, by all the ministers of religion and teachers of youth in the Belgick churches. I should indeed say, *far too much.* And here, I again avow my conviction of the superior wisdom bestowed on the compilers of our articles, on the several points under consideration; in which, while nothing essential is omitted or feebly stated a generality of language is observed, far more suitable to the design, than the decrees of this Synod, and tending to preserve peace and harmony among all truly humble Christians, who do not in all respects see eye to eye, yet may "receive one another, but not to "doubtful disputations:" whereas the very exactness, and particularity, into which, what I must judge, scriptural doctrine is branched out, and errors reprobated, powerfully counteracted the intended effect, and probably more than any thing else, or all other things combined, has brought on this Synod such decided but unmerited odium and reproach.

4. I would observe, that using the arm of the magistrate, and inflicting penalties on those who stood out against the decisions of the Synod, not being mentioned in the preface, will more properly be considered, in another stage of our progress. But had the decrees been promulgated, and compliance with them demanded, from all who acted as ministers of religion, or teachers of youth in the established seminaries

of the Belgick church; with simply the *exclusion* from such stations, of those, who declined compliance, or violated their engagements to comply; while a toleration was granted, as at present in Britain, either to preach, or teach in other places or schools: the terms might indeed have been considered as too strict, and requiring more than could reasonably be expected; but, in other respects, it does not appear, that the conduct of the Synod would have been blameable. For, every body or company of professed Christians, down from established national churches, to independent dissenting congregations, prescribe terms of communion, or of officiating as ministers on those, who desire *voluntarily* to join them, and exclude such as decline compliance.'

How far the revenues, in the Belgick churches, could, with any propriety, have been shared, and any portion of them allotted, to what we might call the dissenting teachers, I am not prepared to say. But, as toleration (in this sense at least) was no part of the system at the Reformation *in any* country; the ancient revenues for religious purposes, as far as they were preserved for those uses, of course were allotted to the established ministers in the different churches. Neither *dissenters*, nor *provision* for dissenters, were thought of: and it would afterwards have been expecting too much in general, to suppose that they who found themselves in possession of these revenues, would voluntarily share them with the dissentients, or that rulers would venture to compel them. Yet, if to a full toleration, something had publickly been allotted towards the support of *peaceful* and *conscientious* dissenting teachers; it would, as it appears to me at least, have had a most powerful effect in diminishing acrimony, silencing objections, and promoting peace and love.

ARTICLES OF THE SYNOD OF DORT.

'The Articles of the Synod of Dort, Heylin introduces 'in this manner:—'Because particular men may sometimes 'be mistaken in a public doctrine, and that the judgment 'of such men, being collected by the hands of their enemies, 'may be unfaithfully related; we will next look on the 'conclusions of the Synod of Dort, which is to be conceived 'to have delivered the genuine sense of all the parties, as 'being a representative of all the Calvinian Churches of 'Europe, (except those of France,) some few Divines of 'England being added to them. Of the calling and pro-'ceedings of this Synod we shall have occasion to speak 'further in the following chapter. At this time I shall only 'lay down the results thereof in the five controverted points '(as I find them abbreviated by Dan. Tilenus) according 'to the heads before mentioned in summing up the doctrine 'of the Council of Trent.'*

A few things may here be noted.—Is it very probable, that such decided Anticalvinists, as Heylin or Collier should be impartial, in their account of this celebrated Synod?—Is it to be supposed, that there was no difference of sentiment among the persons of whom it was composed?—Were four divines an adequate representation of all the Calvinists in England? Did not one, or more, of all these four, dissent from the decisions of this Synod? Were other protestant countries represented in any great degree more adequately? Were not the leading men greatly embittered with personal

* Refutation of Calvinism, p. 566.

enmities, and the spirit of persecution and resentment? Did not political interests, and the spirit of party, still more embitter the spirits, or sway the deliberations and conclusions of the Synod? And therefore are all the Calvinists, who lived at that time, or who now live, or whoever shall live, to be judged according to the proceedings of the Synod of Dort? It would be no difficult undertaking, by such a procedure, to fix very heavy charges on the whole body of Anticalvinists in Europe and in the world: but attempts of this kind prove nothing; except a disposition to act the part of a special pleader in the controversy, rather than that of an impartial judge. As I, however, had met with the same abstract of the articles of this Synod, in other publications more favourable to Calvinism, I had no suspicion that *these* were not the real articles of the Synod, but an abbreviation, (yet with several clauses also *added*,) an abbreviation by avowed opponents. But the Christian Observer first excited a suspicion that these were not the real articles of the Synod; and led me to enquire after a copy of those articles, which are indeed immensely more discordant with the abbreviations than I could have previously imagined. But let the attentive reader judge, from the following literal translation of these articles, &c. as contained in the *Sylloge Confessionum*, Oxford 1804.

CHAPTER I.

Of the Doctrine of Divine Predestination.

Art. 1. As all men have sinned in Adam, and have become exposed to the curse and eternal death, God would have done no injustice to any one, if he had determined to leave the whole human race under sin and the curse, and to condemn them on account of sin; according to those words of the Apostle, "All the world is become guilty

"before God." Rom. iii. 19. "All have sinned, and "come short of the glory of God." 23. And "The wages "of sin is death." Rom. vi. 23.*

2. But "in this is the love of God manifested, that "he sent his only begotten Son into the world, that every "one who believeth in him should not perish, but have "everlasting life." 1 John iv. 9. John iii. 16.

3. But that men may be brought to faith, God mercifully sends heralds of this most joyful message, to whom he willeth, and when he willeth, by whose ministry men are called to repentance, and faith in Christ crucified. For "How "shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? "and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how "shall they preach except they be sent?" Rom. x. 14, 15.

4. They who believe not the Gospel, on them the wrath of God remaineth: but those who receive it, and embrace the Saviour Jesus with a true and living faith, are, through *him*, delivered from the wrath of God, and receive the gift of everlasting life (*ac vitâ eternâ donantur*).†

5. The cause or fault of this unbelief, as also of all other sins, is by no means in God, but in man. But faith in Jesus Christ, and salvation by him, is the free gift of God: "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of "yourselves, *it is* the gift of God." Eph ii. 8. In like manner, "It is given you to believe in Christ." Phil. i. 29.‡

6. That some, *in time*, have faith given them by God, and others have it not given, proceeds from his *eternal* decree; For, "known unto God are all his works, from "the beginning of the world." Acts xv. 18. Eph. i. 11.§ According to which decree, he graciously softens the hearts

* Gal. iii. 10. 22.—'In every person born into the world, it (original 'sin,) deserveth God's wrath and damnation.' Art. ix.

† Rom. vi. 23. ‡ See Art. x.

§ Eph. i. 4, 5. iii. 11. 2 Thess. ii. 13, 14. 2 Tim. i. 9, 10. Tit. i. 2. 1 Pet. i. 2. 20. Rev. xiii. 8. xvii. 8.

of the elect, however hard, and he bends them to believe: but the non-elect he leaves, in just judgment, to their own perversity and hardness.* And here, especially, a deep discrimination, at the same time both merciful and just, a discrimination of men equally lost, opens itself to us; or that decree of *Election* and *Reprobation* which is revealed in the word of God. Which, as perverse, impure, and unstable persons do wrest to their own destruction, so it affords ineffable consolation to holy and pious souls.†

7. But Election is the immutable purpose of God, by which, before the foundations of the world were laid, he chose, out of the whole human race, fallen by their own fault from their primeval integrity into sin and destruction, according to the most free good pleasure of his own will, and of mere grace, a certain number of men, neither better nor worthier than others, but lying in the same misery with the rest, to

* 'Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby, 'before the foundations of the world were laid, he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation 'those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring 'them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honour. 'Wherefore they which are endued with so excellent a benefit of God, 'be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due 'season: they through grace obey the calling; they be justified freely, '&c.' Art. xvii.

† 'As the godly consideration of predestination and our election in Christ 'is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons, 'and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members, and drawing up 'their minds to high and heavenly things; as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation, to be enjoyed through 'Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love to God: so for curious 'and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before 'their eyes the sentence of God's predestination, is a most dangerous downfal, 'whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.' Art. xvii. Whatever method of interpretation be adopted, as to the different parts of this our article; they, who cordially approve it, cannot consistently object to this article of the Synod of Dort, which is entirely coincident with it; and at least not more decided and explicit.

salvation in Christ; whom he had, even from eternity, constituted Mediator and Head of all the elect, and the foundation of Salvation; and therefore he decreed to give them unto him to be saved, and effectually to call and draw them, into communion with him, by his own word and Spirit; or he decreed himself to give unto them true faith,* to justify, to sanctify, and at length powerfully to glorify them, having been kept in the communion of his Son; to the demonstration of his mercy, and the praise of the riches of his glorious grace, as it is written: "God hath chosen us in "Christ before the foundations of the world were laid, that "we should be holy and without blame before him in love; "having predestinated us unto the adoption of children, by "Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure "of his will. To the praise of the glory of his grace, "wherein he hath freely made us accepted to himself in "that Beloved One." Eph. i. 4—6. And in another place, "Whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and "whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he "justified, them he also glorified." Rom. viii. 30.

8. This Election is not multiform, but one and the same of all that shall be saved, in the Old and New Testament, seeing that the Scripture declares the good pleasure, purpose, and counsel of the will of God, by which he has, from eternity, chosen us to grace and glory: both to salvation and the way of salvation, which he hath "before prepared that "we should walk in it."†

9. This same Election is not made from any foreseen faith, obedience of faith, holiness, or any other good quality and disposition, as a *pre-requisite cause* or condition in the

* 'We believe that the Holy Spirit dwelling in our hearts, imparts 'to us true faith, that we may obtain the knowledge of so great a 'mystery.'—Belgick Confession.

† 2 Thess. ii. 13, 14. 1 Pet. i. 2.

man who should be elected, but *unto* faith, and *unto* the obedience of faith, holiness, &c. And, therefore, (or truly, *proinde*) election is the fountain of every saving benefit; whence faith, holiness, and the other salutary gifts, and finally, eternal life itself, flow as its fruit and effect, according to that word of the Apostle: "He hath chosen us (not because we *were*, but) "that we *might* be holy, and "without blame before him in love." Eph. i. 4.

10. Now the cause of this gratuitous Election, is the sole good pleasure of God:* not consisting in this, that he elected into the condition of salvation certain qualities or human actions, from all that were possible; but in that, out of the common multitude of sinners, he took to himself certain persons as his peculiar property, according to the scripture: "For the *children* being not yet born, neither "having done any good or evil, &c, it is said," (that is, to Rebecca,) "The elder shall serve the younger: even as "it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." (Rom. ix. 11—13.) And, "As many as were ordained (*or*- "*dinati*) to eternal life, believed." Acts xiii. 48.

11. And as God himself is most wise, immutable, omniscient, and omnipotent; so, election made by him can neither be interrupted, changed, recalled, nor broken off; nor can the Elect be cast away, nor the number of them be diminished.

12. Of this, his eternal and immutable election to salvation, the elect, though by various steps, and in an unequal measure, are rendered certain (or assured); not indeed by curiously scrutinizing the deep and mysterious things of God; but by observing in themselves, with spiritual delight and holy pleasure, the infallible fruits of election described in God's word; such as true faith in Christ, filial fear of God, sorrow for sin, according unto God (λυπη κατα Θεον—

* Matt. xi. 26. Eph. i. 5. 1 Tim. i. 9. Jam. i. 18.

"Godly sorrow,"*) hungering and thirsting after righteousness, &c.†

13. From the sense and assurance (*certitudine*) of this election, the children of God daily find greater cause of humbling themselves before God, of adoring the abyss of his mercies, of purifying themselves, and of more ardently loving him reciprocally, who had before so loved them: so far are they from being rendered, by this doctrine of Election, and the meditation of it, more slothful in observing the divine commands, or carnally secure.‡ Wherefore, by the just judgment of God, it is wont to happen to those who either are rashly presuming, or idly and frowardly *prating* (*fabulantes*) about the grace of Election, that they are not willing to walk in the ways of the Elect.

14. But as this doctrine of divine Election, in the most wise counsel of God was predicated by the prophets, by Christ himself and by the Apostles, under the Old, as well as under the New Testament, and then committed to the monuments of the sacred scriptures; so it is to be declared at this day by the church of God, to whom it is peculiarly destinated, with a spirit of discrimination, in a holy and religious manner, in its own place and time, all curious scrutinizing the ways of the Most High being laid aside: and this to the glory of the most holy divine name, and for the lively solace of his people.§

* 2 Cor. vii. 10. Gr.

† How different is this from the generally circulated opinion, that they who believe election, in the Calvinistick sense, are taught to assume it a certainty, that they are the elect without further evidence! In this the vehement opposers, and the perverters of the doctrine, seem to coincide; but no more with the Synod of Dort, than with St. Peter's exhortation, 2 Pet. i. 5—10.

‡ 1 Cor. xv. 58. Col. iii. 13, 14. 1 John iii. 2, 3.

§ Election, as a part of divine revelation, and of the "whole counsel "of God," must be preached: we must "not shun to declare it;" for in doing so, what do we, but presume ourselves wiser than he who revealed it as a part of his counsel; and decide that it ought not to

15. Moreover, Holy Scripture doth illustrate and commend to us, this eternal and free grace of our election, in this more especially, that, it doth also testify all men not to be elected, but that some are non-elect, or *passed by* in the eternal election of God, whom truly God, from most free, just, irreprehensible, and immutable, good pleasure, decreed to leave in the *common misery*, into which they had, by *their own fault*, cast themselves, and not to bestow on them living faith, and the grace of conversion; but, having been left in their own ways, and under just judgment, at length not only on account of their unbelief, but also of all their other sins, to condemn and eternally punish them to the manifestation of his own justice.* And this is the decree of *Reprobation*, which determines that God is in no wise the Author of sin, (which to be thought of is blasphemy,) but a tremendous, irreprehensible, just Judge and Avenger.

16. Those who do not as yet feel efficaciously in themselves a lively faith in Christ, or an assured confidence of

have been revealed? But this declaration must be made, with 'discrimination, in a holy and religious manner, &c.' Thus declared in its proper connection, application, and *proportion*, as in the sacred scriptures, it will greatly conduce to improve the true believer's character, his humility, gratitude, admiring love of God, meekness, compassion, and good will to man, as well as his comfort and joy of hope. It will also exhibit the gospel of most free and rich grace, in its unclouded glory, cast a clearer light on every other part of divine truth; and secure to the Lord alone, the whole honour of man's salvation. Yet the same doctrine, rashly, indiscriminately, and disproportionately, preached; and not properly stated and improved, does immense mischief.

* 'He' (God) 'secluded from saving grace all the rest of mankind '*(except a very small number)* and appointed them by the same decree 'to eternal damnation, *without any regard to their infidelity and impenitency*.'—Heylin's Abbreviation. Is not this a direct violation of the command, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour?" Or are not Calvinists to be considered as *neighbours* by Anti-Calvinists? And do not they who retail the false accusation, *intentionally*, or *heedlessly* share a measure of the criminality? Is this the *moral practice*, which is contended for by Anti-Calvinists?

heart, peace of conscience, earnest desire (*studium*) of filial obedience, glorying in God through Christ, yet nevertheless use the means by which God has promised to work these things in us, ought not to be alarmed by the mention of *Reprobation*, nor reckon themselves to be reprobate; but to use diligently the means of grace, and ardently to desire, and reverently and humbly to expect the period of more abounding (or fructifying, *uberius*) grace. And much less should those persons be terrified by the doctrine of Reprobation, who, when seriously converted to God, simply desire to please him, and to be delivered from the body of death, yet cannot attain to what they wish in the path of faith and piety; because the merciful God hath promised that he will not "quench the smoking flax, nor break the bruised "reed."* But this doctrine is justly for a terror to those who, forgetful of God and the Saviour Jesus Christ, have delivered themselves wholly to the cares and carnal pleasures of the world, so long as they are not in earnest (*serio*) converted unto God.

17. Seeing that we are to judge of the will of God by his word, which testifies that the children of believers are holy, not indeed by nature, but by the benefit of the gracious covenant, in which they are comprehended along with their parents; pious parents ought not to doubt of the election and salvation of their children, whom God hath called in infancy out of this life.†

* 'Furthermore, we must receive God's promises, in such wise, as 'they be generally set forth to us in holy scripture, and that will of God 'is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the word 'of God.'—Art. xvii. Church of England. John vi. 37—40.

† The salvation of the offspring of believers, dying in infancy, is here scripturally stated, and not limited to such as are baptized. Nothing is said of the children of unbelievers dying in infancy; and the scripture says nothing. But why might not these Calvinists have as favourable a hope of all infants dying before actual sin, as Anti-Calvinists can have?

18. Against those who murmur at this grace of *gratuitous* election, and the severity of *just* reprobation, we oppose this word of the Apostle: "O man, who art thou that re-"pliest against God?" Rom. ix. 20: And that of our Saviour: "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with "mine own?" Matt. xx. 15. We indeed, piously adoring these mysteries, exclaim with the Apostle: "Oh the depths "of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! "How unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past "finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord, "or who hath been his Counsellor! Or who hath first given "to him, and it shall be recompensed to him again! For "of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to "whom be glory for ever. Amen."*

These eighteen articles concerning predestination are *abbreviated* by Dan. Tilenus, and reported by Heylin, in the following single article.

Of divine Predestination.

'That God, by an absolute decree, hath elected to 'salvation, *a very small number* of men without any regard 'to their faith and obedience whatsoever; and secluded from 'saving grace all the rest of mankind, and appointed them 'by the same decree to eternal damnation, without any re-'gard to their infidelity and impenitency.'

I have long been aware, that there is "no new thing under "the sun;"† and that "speaking all manner of evil falsely," of the disciples of Christ, is no exception to this rule;

* A more appropriate and scriptural conclusion of these articles, cannot even be imagined. † Ecc. i. 9, 10.

and that misrepresenting and slandering men called Calvinists has been very general, ever since the term was invented: but I own, I never before met with so gross, so barefaced, and inexcusable a misrepresentation as this, in all my studies of modern controversy.—It can only be equalled by the false testimony borne against Jesus and his apostles, as recorded in holy writ. But is that cause likely to be in itself *good*, and of God, which needs to be supported by so unhallowed weapons?

Rejection of Errors by which the Belgick Churches have for some time been disturbed.

The orthodox doctrine of Election and Reprobation, having been stated, the Synod rejects the errors of those,

1. Who teach that 'The will of God, concerning the saving of those who shall believe, and persevere in faith and the obedience of faith, is the whole and entire decree of Election unto salvation; and that there is nothing else whatever concerning this decree revealed in the word of God.' For these persons impose upon the more simple, and manifestly contradict the sacred scripture, which testifies, not only that God will save those who shall believe, but also that he hath chosen certain persons from eternity to whom, in preference to others, (*præ aliis*) he may, in time, give faith and perseverance: as it is written: "I have made known thy name "unto the men whom thou hast given me." John xvii. 6. Also, "As many as were ordained unto eternal life believed." Acts xii. 48. And, "He hath chosen us before the foundation "of the world, that we should be holy, &c." Eph. i. 4.

2. Who teach that 'The election of God to eternal life is of different kinds (*multiplicem*): one, general and indefinite; another, singular and definite: And again, this

either incomplete, revocable, not peremptory, or conditional; or else complete, irrevocable, peremptory, or absolute.' In like manner, 'that one election is to faith, another to salvation: so that there may be an election to justifying faith, without a peremptory election to salvation.' This is indeed a comment excogitated by the human brain without the scriptures, corrupting the doctrine of election, and dissolving this golden chain of salvation: "Whom he predestinated, them he also "called, whom he called, those he also justified, and whom "he justified, those he also glorified." Rom. viii. 30.*

3. Who teach, 'That the good pleasure and purpose of God which the scripture mentions in the doctrine of election does not consist in this, that God before selected certain men above the rest (*præ aliis*); but in this, that God chose, that from among all possible conditions, (among which are also the works of the law,) or from the order of all things, the act of faith, ignoble in itself, and the imperfect obedience of faith, should be the condition of salvation; and willed (*voluerit*) graciously to account this instead of perfect obedience, and to judge it of the reward of eternal life. For by this pernicious error, the good pleasure of God and the merit of Christ are enervated, and men are called away by unprofitable disputations, from the truth of gratuitous justification and the simplicity of the Scriptures; and that of the apostle is accused of falsehood: "God hath called us "with a holy calling; not of works, but of his own purpose "and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the "world began." 2 Tim. i. 9.†

* 'They be called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working 'in due season: they through grace obey the calling, they be justified 'freely, they be made the children of God by adoption, they be made 'like the image of the only begotten Son Jesus Christ, they walk re-'ligiously in good works, and at length by God's mercy they attain 'to everlasting felicity.'—Art. xvii.

† 'We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of

4. Who teach that 'In election to faith this condition is pre-'required, that man should rightly use the light of nature, 'that he should be honest, lowly, humble, and disposed for 'eternal life, as if, upon these things, in some measure, may 'election depend.' For they savour of Pelagius, and by no means obscurely accuse the apostle of falsehood in writing, "Among whom we also had our conversation in times past, "in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh "and of the mind; and were by nature the children of "wrath, even as others. But God, who is rich in mercy, "for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we "were dead in sins, hath made us alive together with "Christ, (by grace ye are saved). And hath raised us up "together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus, that in the "ages to come, he might show the exceeding riches of his "grace, in his kindness towards us through Christ Jesus. "For by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not "of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest "any man should boast." Eph. ii. 3—9.*

5. Who teach that 'Election of individuals to salvation, 'incomplete and not peremptory, is made from foreseen faith, 'repentance, and sanctity and piety begun, and for some 'time persevered in: but that complete and peremptory

'our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works 'or deservings.'—Art. xi. 'Faith is the only hand which putteth on 'Christ unto justification; and Christ the only garment which, being 'so put on, covereth the shame of our defiled nature, hideth the im-'perfection of our works, preserveth us blameless in the sight of God; 'before whom otherwise, the weakness of our faith were cause suf-'ficient to make us culpable: yea, to shut us from the kingdom of 'heaven, where nothing that is not absolute can enter.'—Hooker. The error refuted in this article, is as contrary to the doctrine of our church, as to that of the Synod of Dort.

* This error requires from unregenerate man, and ascribes to nature, that which is the effect of regeneration and grace. Prov. xvi. 1. James i. 15—17. Second Collect, Evening Service.

'election is from the foreseen final perseverance of faith, 'repentance, holiness, and piety: and that this is the gracious 'and evangelical worthiness, on account of which, he who is 'elected, is more deserving than he who is not elected: and 'therefore, faith, the obedience of faith, holiness, piety, and 'perseverance, are not the fruits or effects of immutable 'election to glory, but the conditions and causes required 'before hand, and foreseen as if they were performed in 'the persons to be elected, without which there cannot be 'complete election.' This is what opposes the whole scripture, which every where assails (*ingerit*) our ears and hearts with these and other sayings: "Election is not of works, "but of him that calleth." Rom. ix. 11. "As many as "were ordained to eternal life, believed." *Acts* xiii. 48. "He chose us to himself, that we might be holy." Eph. i. 4. "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." John xv. 16. "If it is of grace, it is not of works." Rom. xi. 6. "Herein "is love: not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and "sent his own Son." 1 John iv. 10.*

6. Who teach that, 'Not all election to salvation is im-'mutable, but that some elect persons, no decree of God 'preventing (*obstante*), may perish, and do perish eternally.' By which gross error, they make God mutable, subvert the consolation of the godly concerning the stability of their election, and contradict the sacred scriptures, whereby we are taught that the elect cannot be deceived: Matt. xxiv. 4. that "Christ loses not those who were given to him by the "Father." John vi. 39. That "those whom he (God) "hath predestinated, called, and justified, them he also "glorifies." Rom. viii. 30.†

* Some of the texts here adduced seem not decidedly conclusive, but may be otherwise explained; but others might easily be substituted, Eph. ii. 4, 5, 9, 10. 2 Tim. i. 9. James i. 17, 18. 1 Pet. i. 2.

† John x. 27—30. 2 Thess. ii. 13, 14. 1 Pet. i. 5. 23—25. 1 John iii. 9. v. 18.

7. Who teach that 'In this life there is no fruit, no 'sense, no certainty of immutable election to glory, except 'from a mutable and contingent condition.' But, besides that it is absurd to mention an uncertain certainty, (*ponere incertam certitudinem*,) these things are opposite to the experience of the saints, who, with the apostle, exult in the consciousness of their election, and celebrate this benefit of God; who *rejoice* with the disciples, according to Christ's admonition, "that their names are written in heaven." Luke x. 20. Who finally oppose the feeling of election to the fiery darts of diabolical temptations, inquiring, "Who shall "lay any thing to the charge of God's elect." Rom. viii. 33.*

8. Who teach that 'God has not decreed from his 'own mere just will, to leave any in the fall of Adam, and 'in the common state of sin and damnation, or to pass 'them by in the communication of grace necessary to faith 'and conversion.' For that passage stands firm, "He hath "mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will "he hardeneth." Rom. ix. 18. Also, "I glorify thee, O "Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for that thou hast hid "these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed "them unto babes; even so Father, for so it hath pleased "thee." Matt. xi. 25, 26.

9. Who teach that 'the reason why God sends the gospel 'to one nation rather than another is not the mere and sole 'good pleasure of God; but because this nation is better

* See Article xii. on Predestination.—'The godly consideration of predestination and our election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and 'unspeakable comfort to godly persons; and such as *feel in themselves* 'the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh, 'and their earthly members, and drawing up their minds to high and 'heavenly things; as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm 'their faith of eternal salvation, to be enjoyed through Christ, as because 'it doth fervently kindle their love towards God.'—Art. xvii. of the Church of England.

'and more deserving than that to which the gospel is not 'communicated.' Yet Moses recals the people of Israel from this, saying, "Behold the heavens and the heaven of "heavens is the Lord thy God's; the earth also, with all "that therein is: only the Lord had a delight in thy fathers "to love them; and he chose their seed after them, even "you above all people, as it is this day." Deut. x. 14, 15. And Christ: "Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, "Bethsaida! for if the mighty works that are done in thee, "had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have re-"pented long ago in sackcloth and ashes." Matt. xi. 21.*

'That we thus think and judge, we testify by the sub-'scription of our hands.'

Then follows a list of the names of all those who subscribed and attested these articles, and refutations, among whom are found, George, Bishop of Landaff, John Davenant, Presbyter, Doctor, and publick professor of sacred theology in the University of Cambridge, and at the same time president (*præses*) of King's College. Samuel Ward, presbyter, Archdeacon *Fauntonnensis* Doctor of sacred theology, and head of Sidney College of the University of Cambridge. Thomas Goad, presbyter, Doctor of sacred theology, and preceptor of the cathedral church of St. Paul, London. Walter Balcanqual (*Scoto-Brittanus*), a Scotchman, presbyter, Batchelor of sacred theology; with very many others from various parts of the continent of Europe, amounting to above eighty. These were deputed by churches, differing from each other, in various respects, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and those in some of the regions which are generally accounted Lutheran, and men that occupied the most important stations in the church and Universities of their several coun-

* This shews that the election of nations is really as opposite to the Anticalvinists' ideas of divine justice as the election of individuals.

tries; yet they all subscribed these articles of the Synod, agreeing in this respect though not in others. For it cannot be supposed, that they who opposed, or were much dissatisfied with any of the conclusions, would thus *voluntarily and solemnly attest and subscribe* the same decisions. This consideration should, in all reason, at least induce us to give these articles a candid and attentive examination, comparing them carefully with the scriptures of truth, and praying for the teaching of the Holy Spirit, that we may not be so left "to "lean to our own understanding," as to *reject* and even to *revile* that, which perhaps may, in great part at least, accord with the "sure testimony of God."

CHAPTER II.

On the Doctrine of the Death of Christ, and through it the Redemption of Men.

1. God is not only supremely merciful, but also supremely just. And his justice requires (according as he hath revealed himself in the word) that our sins committed against his infinite majesty, should be punished, not only with temporal but also with eternal sufferings,—of soul as well as of body; which punishment we cannot escape, unless the justice of God be satisfied.*

2. But as we cannot satisfy it, and deliver ourselves from the wrath of God, God of infinite mercy gave to us his only begotten Son as a Surety, who, that he might make satisfaction for us, was made sin and a curse on the cross for us, or in our stead.†

3. This death of the Son of God is a single and most perfect sacrifice and satisfaction for sins; of infinite value and price, abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world.‡

4. But this death is of so much value and price, on this account; because the person who endured it is not only, truly and perfectly, a holy Man, but also, the only begotten Son of God, of the same eternal and infinite essence with God the Father and the Holy Spirit, such as it behoved our Saviour to be. Finally, because his death was conjoined with the feeling of the wrath and curse of God, which we by our sins had deserved.

* Isa. xlv. 21. Rom. iii. 25, 26.

† Isa. liii. 4—6. 10, 11. 2 Cor. v. 21. Gal. iii. 13. 1 Pet. ii. 24. iii. 18.

‡ John i. 29. 1 John ii. 2. Prayer of consecration. Communion Service. Catechism, second instruction from the articles of the creed.

5. Moreover, the promise of the Gospel is, that whosoever believeth in Christ crucified, shall not perish, but have everlasting life. Which promise ought to be announced and proposed, promiscuously and indiscriminately, to all nations and men, to whom God in his good pleasure hath sent the Gospel, with the command to repent and believe.

6. But because many who are called by the Gospel do not repent, nor believe in Christ, but perish in unbelief; this doth not arise from defect or insufficiency of the sacrifice offered by Christ upon the cross, but from their own fault.*

7. But to as many as truly believe, and through the death of Christ, are delivered and saved from sin and condemnation, this benefit comes from the sole grace of God, which he owes to no man, given them in Christ from eternity.†

8. For this was the most free counsel, and gracious will and intention of God the Father, that the life-giving and saving efficacy, of the most precious death of his own Son, should exert itself in all the elect, in order to give them alone justifying faith, and thereby to lead them to eternal life: that is, God willed that Christ, through the blood of the cross, (by which he confirmed the new covenant) should, out of every people, tribe, nation, and language, *efficaciously* redeem all those, and those only, who were from eternity

* John iii. 19, 20. v. 44. Heb. iii. 5.

† John i. 12. 1 Cor. xv. 10. Phil. i. 29. 2 Thess. ii. 11—14. 'We 'believe, that God, (after that the whole race of Adam had been thus 'precipitated into perdition and destruction, by the fault of the first 'man) demonstrated himself to be such as he is in reality, and to have 'acted as such, (*præstitisse*) namely, both merciful and just; MERCIFUL 'indeed in delivering and saving from damnation and death (*interritu*) 'those, whom in his eternal counsel, according to his gratuitous good-'ness by Jesus Christ our Lord, he elected, without any respect to their 'works: but JUST, in leaving others in that their own fall and per-'dition, into which they had cast themselves headlong.' Belgick Confession, Article xvi.

chosen to salvation, and given to him by the Father; that he should confer on them the gift of faith; (which, as well as other saving gifts of the Holy Spirit, he obtained by his death;) that he should cleanse them by his own blood from all sins, both original and actual, committed after, as well as before faith; that he should preserve them faithfully to the end; and at length present them glorious before himself without any spot and blemish.*

9. This counsel, having proceeded from eternal love to the Elect, from the beginning of the world to this present time, the gates of hell in vain striving against it, has been mightily fulfilled, and will henceforth also be fulfilled: so that indeed the elect may in their time be gathered together in one, and that there may always be some church of believers founded in the blood of Christ, who may constantly love the Saviour, who for her, as a Bridegroom for his bride, gave up his soul upon the cross; and perseveringly worship and celebrate him, here and to all eternity.

These nine articles are thus *abbreviated* by Tilenus and Heylin.

ART. II. *Of the Merit and Effect of Christ's Death.*

'That Jesus Christ hath not suffered death, but for 'those elect only; having neither any intent nor command-'ment from the Father, to make satisfaction for the sins of 'the whole world.'†

* John vi. 37—40, 44, 65. Eph. v. 25—27. 1 Pet. i. 2—5. Rev. v. 9, 10.

† See Articles iv. v.

Rejection of Errors on the Second Chapter.

The orthodox doctrine having been explained, the Synod rejects the errors of those,

1. Who teach, 'That God the Father destined his own 'Son unto the death of the cross, without a certain and de-'finite counsel of saving any one by name, (*nominatim*)* 'so that its own necessity, utility, and meritoriousness, (*dig-'nitas*) might be established unimpaired (*sarta tecta*) to the 'benefit obtained (*impetrationi*) by the death of Christ, and 'be perfect in its measures (*numeris*,) and complete and entire, 'even if the obtained redemption had not, in the fact, been ap-'plied to any individual.' For this assertion is contumelious to the wisdom of God and the merit of Jesus Christ, and is contrary to Scripture; as the Saviour says: "I lay down "my life for the sheep, and I know them." John x. 15. 27. And the prophet Isaiah concerning the Saviour: "When he "shall give himself a sacrifice for sin, he shall see his seed, "he shall prolong his days, and the will of JEHOVAH shall "prosper in his hand." Is. liii. 10. And finally, it overturns the article of faith by which we 'believe the church.'†

2. Who teach 'That this was not the end of the 'death of Christ, that he might, in very deed, confirm the 'new covenant of grace through his blood; but only that 'he might acquire a bare right to the Father of entering 'again into some covenant with men, either of grace or of 'works.' For this contradicts the Scripture, which teaches, that "Christ is become the Surety and Mediator of a better "covenant." Heb. vii. 22. And a testament is at length ratified in those that are dead. Heb. ix. 15. 17.‡

* Rev. xiii. 8. xvii. 8. xx. 15.

† For in this case there might possibly have been no "church of "God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts xx. 28.

‡ Isa. xlii. 6. xlix. 8. Dan. ix. 27. Matt. xxvi. 28. Mark xiv. 24. Gr. Heb. ix. 13—23. xiii. 20.

3. Who teach that 'Christ, by his satisfaction did not 'with certainty (*certo*) merit that very salvation and faith, by 'which this satisfaction of Christ may be effectually applied 'unto salvation; but only that he acquired to the Father, 'power, and a plenary will, of acting anew with men, and 'of prescribing whatever new conditions he willed, the per-'formance of which might depend on the free will of man; 'and therefore it might so happen either that none or that 'all might fulfil them.' Now these think far too meanly of the death of Christ; they in no wise acknowledge the principal fruit, or benefit obtained by it, and recal from hell the Pelagian heresy.*

4. Who teach that 'That new covenant of grace, which 'God the Father, through the intervention of the death of 'Christ, hath ratified with men, does not consist in this, that 'by faith, so far as it apprehends the merit of Christ, we are 'justified before God and saved; but in this, that God, 'having abrogated the exaction of perfect legal obedience, 'imputes (*reputet*) faith itself, and the imperfect obedience 'of faith, for the perfect obedience of the law, and gra-'ciously reckons it as deserving of the reward of eternal 'life.' For these contradict the scripture: "They are jus-"tified freely by his grace, through the redemption made in "Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth as a propitiation, "through faith in his blood." Rom. iii. 24, 25.†

* That so large a body of learned theologians, collected from various churches, should unanimously, and without hesitation and in so strong language, declare the error here rejected, to be the revival of the Pelagian heresy, may indeed astonish and disgust numbers in our age and land, who oppose something, at least exceedingly like this, against the doctrines called evangelical; but it should lead them to reflect on the subject, and to pray over it. Are they not, in opposing Calvinism, reviving and propagating the heresy of Pelagius?

† 'We of good reason and right, say with divine Paul, That "we are justified by faith alone," or "by faith without the works of "the law." But, properly speaking, we by no means understand, that

5. Who teach that 'All men are taken into a state of reconciliation and the grace of the covenant; so that no one on account of original sin is liable to damnation, or to be damned; but that all are exempt from the condemnation of this sin.' For this opinion opposes the scripture, affirming, that "By nature we are the children of wrath."*

6. Who usurp the distinction of impetration and appli-

'faith *by itself*, or *of itself*, justifies us; seeing it is that which becomes indeed as an instrument, by which we apprehend Christ our Righteousness. Christ therefore himself is our Righteousness, who imputes unto us all his own merits; but faith is an instrument, by which we are joined to him in the society or communion of all his goods, and are retained in it: insomuch that all these having been made our's, are more than sufficient for us for our absolution from sins.' Belgick Confession, Art. xxii.

* See on the third article of the Rejection of Errors, concerning divine Predestination. 'Original sin, the fault and corruption of every man that is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam, in every person born into this world, deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe, and are baptized; yet the apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.' Art. ix. Church of England.

'We believe, that the disobedience of Adam's sin, which they call original, (*originis*), hath been spread abroad, and poured out upon the whole human race. But original sin is the corruption of the whole nature, and hereditary vice, by which even infants themselves, in the mothers' womb are polluted: and which, as a certain noxious root, shoots forth (*progerminat*) every kind of sins in man; and is so base and execrable before God, that it suffices for the condemnation of the whole human race. Neither is it to be believed, that it is entirely extinguished or pulled up by the roots in baptism; seeing that from it, as from a corrupt fountain, perpetual streams and rivulets continually arise and flow forth; though it does not fall out to condemnation, and is not imputed, to the children of God: but is remitted *to them* by the pure grace and mercy of God; not that they should fall asleep confiding in this remission; but that it should excite the more frequent groans (*gemitus*) in the faithful; and that they should more ardently desire to be freed from this body of death. Hence we condemn the error of the Pelagians, who assert, that original sin is nothing but imitation.' Phil. ii. 13. John xv. 5. Psalm li. 7. Rom. iii. 10. Gen. vi. 3. John iii. 6. Rom. v. 14. Eph. ii. 5. Rom. vii. 18—24. Belgick Confession.

cation, that they may instil this opinion into the unwary and inexperienced; that God, as far as pertained to him, had willed to confer equally upon all men the benefits which were acquired by the death of Christ: and that some rather than others (*præ aliis*) should be partakers of the remission of sins and eternal life, this discrimination depended on their free will, applying to themselves of the grace indifferently offered; not from an especial gift of mercy operating effectually in them, that they, rather than others, should apply to themselves this grace. For these, while they pretend to propose to themselves this distinction in a wholesome sense, endeavour to give the people a taste of the pernicious poison of Pelagianism.*

7. Who teach that 'Christ neither could nor ought to 'die, neither did he die, for those whom God especially '(*summe*) loved and chose to eternal life, when to such there 'was no need of the death of Christ.' For they contradict the apostle, saying, "Christ loved me, and gave himself for "me." Gal. ii. 20. Also, "Who can lay any thing to the "charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is "he that condemneth? It is Christ who died:" Rom. viii. 32, 34, doubtless, for them. And the Saviour who declared, "I lay down my life for my sheep." John x. 15. And, "This is my command, that ye love one another, as "I have loved you; greater love hath no man than this, "that he lay down his life for his friends." John xv. 12, 13.

* 1 Cor. xv. 10. Eph. ii. 3—6. Tit. iii. 4—6. Art. x. of the Church of England, on Free-will.

'We believe, that the Holy Spirit dwelling in our hearts imparts unto 'us true faith, that we may attain to the true knowledge of this so 'great a mystery; which faith embraces Jesus Christ, with all his merits, 'and claims it to itself, as its proper effect, and seeks thenceforth nothing 'beyond him. Belgick Confession. Art. xxii.

CHAPTERS III. & IV.

Of the Doctrine of Man's Corruption, and of the Method of his Conversion to God.

1. Man, from the beginning was created in the image of God, adorned in his mind, with the true and saving knowledge of his Creator and of spiritual things, with righteousness in his will and heart, and purity in all his affections, and thus was altogether holy; but, by the instigation of the devil and his own free will (*libera sua voluntate,*) revolting from God, he bereaved himself of these inestimable gifts; and, on the contrary, in their place, contracted in himself blindness, horrible darkness, and perversity of judgment in the mind; malice, rebellion, hardness, in the will and heart; and finally, impurity in all his affections.

2. And such as man was after the fall, such children also he begat: namely, being corrupted, corrupt ones; corruption having been derived from Adam to all his posterity, (Christ only excepted,) not by imitation as the Pelagians formerly would have it, but by the propagation of a vicious nature, through the just judgment of God.*

3. Therefore, all men are conceived in sin, and born the children of wrath, indisposed (*inepti*) to all saving good, propense to evil, dead in sins, and the slaves of sin; and,

* 'Hence we condemn the error of the Pelagians, who assert that 'this original sin (*peccatum originis*) is no other thing than imitation.' Belgick Confession, Art. xv.

'Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (*in imitatione 'Adami*) as the Pelagians do vainly talk (*fabulantur*); but it is the 'fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is 'engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone '(*quam longissime distet*) from original righteousness, and is of his own 'nature inclined to evil, &c. Art. ix. Church of England.'

without the grace of the regenerating Holy Spirit, they neither are willing nor able to return to God, to correct their depraved nature, or to dispose themselves to the correction of it.*

4. There is indeed remaining in man, since the fall, some light of nature, by the help of which, he retains certain notions concerning God and natural things; concerning the difference of things honourable and shameful, and manifests some desire after virtue and external discipline; but, so far from his being able, by this light of nature, to attain to the saving knowledge of God, or to turn himself to him, he does not use it rightly in natural and civil things: nay, indeed, whatever thing it may at length be, he contaminates it all in various ways, and holds it in unrighteousness, which when he does he is rendered inexcusable before God.†

5. The reason (or purport or purpose, *ratio*) of the decalogue, particularly delivered from God, by Moses, to the Jews, is the same as that of the light of nature; for when indeed it exposes the magnitude of sin, and more and more convicts man of guilt; yet it neither discloses a remedy, nor confers the power of emerging from misery; so that, being rendered weak through the transgression of the flesh,

* See on Rejection of Errors, chap. ii. Art. 6.

† Man, by the fall 'entirely withdrew himself from God, (his true 'life), and alienated himself, his nature having been wholly vitiated and 'corrupted by his sin; by which it came to pass, that he rendered himself 'obnoxious, as well to corporeal, as to spiritual death. Therefore having 'become wicked and perverse, and in all his ways and pursuits (*studiis*) 'corrupt, he lost all those excellent gifts, with which he (God) had 'adorned him; so that only small sparks and slender remains (*vestigia*) 'of them are left to him, which yet suffice to render men inexcusable; 'because whatever there is in us of light, hath been turned into blind 'darknesses.'* Belgick Confession, Art. xiv.

* Rom. i. 18. 28. ii. 1. 12. 16. Eph. iv. 17—19.

it leaves him under the curse, and man cannot through it obtain saving grace.*

6. What, therefore, neither the light of nature nor the law could do, *that* God performs by the power of the Holy Spirit, through the word, or the ministry of reconciliation; which is the gospel concerning the Messiah, by which it *hath* pleased God to save believers, as well under the Old, as under the New Testament.†

7. God revealed this mystery of his own will to fewer persons under the Old Testament; but now, the distinction of people being taken away, he manifests it to more. The cause of which dispensation is not to be ascribed to the dignity (or worthiness) of one nation above another, or to the better use of the light of nature; but to the most free good pleasure and gratuitous love of God.—Therefore they to whom, beyond and contrary to all merit, such grace is given (*fit*) ought to acknowledge it with a humble and thankful heart: in respect of the rest to whom this grace is not given, to adore with the apostle the severity and justice of the judgments of God, but by no means to scrutinize them curiously.‡

8. But as many as are invited by the gospel, are invited sincerely (or in earnest, *serio*). For sincerely and most truly God shews in his word, what is pleasing to him; namely, that they who are called should come to him. And he sincerely promises to all who come to him, and believe, the peace of their souls and eternal life.§

9. That many, who are called by the ministry of the

* Rom. iii. 20. v. 20. viii. 3. 2 Cor. iii. 7. 9. Gal. iii. 10. 22.

† Rom. viii. 3. Gal. iii. 22. Heb. iv. 1, 2. xi. 7. Both in 'the Old and New Testament, everlasting life is offered to mankind by 'Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both 'God and man.'—Art. vii. Church of England.

‡ See Rejection of Errors on first chapter, Art. ix.

§ Matt. xxii. 4—10. John vi. 37—40. Rev. xxi. 6. xxii. 17.

gospel, do not come and are not converted, the fault of this is not in the gospel, nor in Christ offered by the gospel, nor in God inviting by the gospel, and conferring various gifts on them; but in the persons themselves who are invited: some of whom being regardless, (or unconcerned *securi*,) do not admit the word of eternal life: others indeed admit it, (*admittunt*,) but do not receive (*immittunt*) it into their heart, so that they turn back after an evanescent joy of temporary faith; and others choke the seed of the word with the thorns of the cares and pleasures of the world, and bring forth no fruit: as our Saviour teaches us in the parable of the sower. Matt. xiii.*

10. And that others, who are called by the ministry of the gospel, do come and are converted, this is not to be ascribed to man, as if distinguishing himself by free-will (*libero arbitrio*) from others, furnished with equal or sufficient grace for faith and conversion, (which the proud heresy of Pelagius states,) but to God, who, as he chose his own people in Christ from eternity, so he also effectually calls them in time; gives them repentance and faith; and, having been rescued (*erutos*) from the power of darkness, translates them into the kingdom of his Son, that they may declare his energies (*virtutes*) who called them out of darkness into this marvellous light; and glory, not in themselves but in God:—the apostolick scripture every where testifying this.†

* Luke vii. 19—15. John iii. 19—21. Heb. iii. 12. Gr. iv. 2.

† Whatever things are delivered to us concerning the free-will (*libero arbitrio*) of man, these we deservedly reject; because he is the slave of sin; and man can do nothing of himself, unless it hath been given to him from heaven. For who will dare to boast that he can perform whatsoever things he shall will; when Christ himself saith, "No one can come unto me, except the Father who sent me, shall draw him?" Who will boast his own will, who hears, that "the affections of the flesh are enmities against God?" Who will glory in his understanding, who knows that the animal man is not capable of those things which are of the Spirit of God? In fine, who will bring forward (*proferat in medium*)

11. But, when God performs his good pleasure in his elect, or works in them true conversion, he not only provides that the Gospel should be outwardly preached to them, and that their mind should be powerfully illuminated by the Holy Spirit, that they may rightly understand, and judge what are the things of the Spirit of God; but he also, by the efficacy of the same regenerating Spirit, penetrates into the innermost recesses of man, opens his closed heart, softens his obdurate heart, circumcises his uncircumcised heart, infuses new qualities into his will, makes that which had been dead alive, that which was evil good, that which had been unwilling willing, and from being refractory, obedient; and leads and strengthens it, that as a good tree, it may be able to bring forth the fruit of good works.*

12. And this is that regeneration, which is so much declared in the scriptures, a new creation, a resurrection from the dead, a giving of life, (*vivificatio*,) which God *without us* (that is, without our concurrence) worketh *in us*. And this is by no means effected by the doctrine alone sounding *without*, by moral suasion, or by such a mode of working, that after the operation of God (as far as he is concerned) it should remain in the power of man, to be regenerated or not regenerated, converted or not converted; but it is manifestly an operation supernatural, at the same time

'any thought of his own, who understands, that "we are not sufficient "of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves," but that we are suf-'ficient, all this is of God? That which the apostle hath said ought 'to remain certain and firm: "It is God who worketh in us, both that "we may be willing, and that we may effect (*it*) of his own most "gratuitous benevolence." Phil. ii. 13. For no mind no will ac-'quiesces in the will of God, in which Christ himself hath not first 'worked; which he also teacheth, saying, "Without me ye are able "to do nothing." John xv. 5. Belgick Confession, Art. xiv.

* Deut. xxx. 6. Ps. cx. 3. Bible translation. Jer. xxxi. 33. xxxii. 39. Ez. xi. 19. xxxvi. 25, 26. Zech. xii. 10. Matt. xi. 25, 26. John i. 12. iii. 3—6. vi. 44, 45. 65. Eph. ii. 4, 5. Phil. i. 13. Col. i. 13. 1 Thess. ii. 13, 14. Tit. iii. 4—6. 1 Pet. i. 3. ii. 9, 10.

most powerful, and most sweet, wonderful, secret, and ineffable in its power, according to the scripture (which is inspired by the Author of this operation) not less than, or inferior to, creation, or the resurrection of the dead: so that all those, in whose hearts God works in this admirable manner, are, certainly, infallibly, and efficaciously regenerated, and in fact (*actu*) believe.* And thus their will, being now renewed, is not only influenced and moved by God, but being acted on by God, itself acts and moves. Wherefore, the man himself, through this grace received, is rightly said to believe and repent.†

13. Believers cannot in this life, fully comprehend the manner of this operation: in the mean time they acquiesce in it; because, by this grace of God, they know and feel, that they believe in their heart and love their Saviour.

14. Thus, therefore, faith is the gift of God; not in that it is offered to the will of man by God, but that the thing itself is conferred on him, inspired, infused into him. Not even that God only confers the power of believing, but from thence expects the consent, or the act of believing: but that he, who worketh both to will and to do, worketh in man both to will to believe, and to believe itself, (*et velle credere et ipsum credere*,) and thus he worketh all things in all.‡

15. This grace God owes to no one. For what can he owe to him, who is able to give nothing first, that he may be recompensed?§ Nay, what can he owe to him, who has nothing of his own but sin and a lie? He therefore, who

* John v. 21. 24, 25. Rom. vi. 4—6. viii. 2. 2 Cor. v. 17, 18. Gal. vi. 15. Eph. i. 19, 20. ii. 6. 10. Col. ii. 12, 13. iii. 1.

† Jer. xxxi. 18, 19. Acts iii. 19. v. 31. Rom. viii. 13. 2 Tim. ii. 25, 26. 1 Pet. i. 22.

‡ 'We believe that the Holy Spirit dwelling in our hearts doth 'impart to us true faith.' Belgick Confession, Art. xxii.

§ Rom. xi. 35.

receives this grace, owes and renders everlasting thanks to God: he who receives it not, either does not care for those spiritual things, and rests satisfied within himself; or, being secure, he vainly glories that he possesses, what he has not. Moreover concerning those who outwardly profess faith, and amend their lives, it is best to judge and speak after the example of the apostles; for the inmost recesses (*penetralia*) of the heart, are to us impenetrable. As for those who have not yet been called, it behoves us to pray to God, who calls the things which are not, as though they were: but in no wise are we to act proudly against them (*adversus superbiendum eos est*) as if we had made ourselves to differ.*

16. But in like manner, as by the fall man does not cease to be man, endowed with intellect and will, neither hath sin, which has pervaded the whole human race, taken away the nature of the human species, but it hath depraved and spiritually stained it; so even this divine grace of regeneration does not act upon men like stocks and trees, nor take away the proprieties (or properties, *proprietates*) of his will, or violently compel it while unwilling; but it spiritually quickens, (or vivifies,) heals, corrects, and sweetly, and at the same time, powerfully inclines it: so that whereas before it was wholly governed by the rebellion and resistance of the flesh, now, prompt and sincere obedience of the Spirit may begin to reign; in which the renewal of our spiritual will and our liberty truly consist. In which manner, (or for which reason,) unless the admirable Author of all good should work in us, there could be no hope to man of rising from the fall, by that *free-will*, by which when standing, he fell into ruin.†

* Rom. xi. 18—20. 1 Cor. iv. 6, 7.

† A more lucid and scriptural exposition of the efficacious influence, by which the regenerating, life-giving, illuminating grace of the Holy Spirit, draws, teaches, and inclines the heart, to willing and sweet submission and obedience, can hardly be produced from any writer. 2 Cor. x. 5.

17. But in the same manner as the omnipotent operation of God, whereby he produces and supports our natural life, doth not exclude, but require the use of means, by which God in his infinite wisdom and goodness sees fit to exercise this his power: so this fore-mentioned supernatural power of God by which he regenerates us, in no wise excludes, or sets aside the use of the gospel, which the most wise God hath ordained as the seed of regeneration and the food of the soul. Wherefore, as the apostles, and those teachers who followed them, have piously instructed the people concerning this grace of God, in order to his glory and to the keeping down of all pride; in the mean time neither have they neglected (being admonished by the holy gospel) to keep them under the exercise of the word, the sacraments, and discipline: so then, be it far from us, that teachers or learners in the church should presume to tempt God, by separating those things, which God, of his own good pleasure, would have most closely united together. For grace is conferred through admonitions, and the more promptly we do our duty, the more illustrious the benefit of God, who worketh in us, is wont to be, and the most rightly doth his work proceed. To whom alone, all the glory, both of the means and their beneficial fruits and efficacy, is due for everlasting. Amen.*

These seventeen articles are abbreviated, as above stated, in these two that follow.

Art. III. *Of Man's Will in a State of Nature.*

'That by Adam's fall his posterity lost their free-will, 'being put to an unavoidable necessity to do, or not to do, 'whatsoever they do or do not, whether it be good or

* Can any statement be more rational, unexceptionable, and scriptural than this is?

'evil; being thereunto predestinated by the eternal and 'effectual secret decree of God.'

Art. IV. *Of the Manner of Conversion.*

'That God, to save his elect from the corrupt mass, doth 'beget faith in them, by a power equal to that whereby he 'created the world and raised up the dead: insomuch, that 'such unto whom he gives grace cannot reject, and the 'rest, being reprobate, cannot accept it.*

Rejection of Errors on the Third and Fourth Chapters.

The orthodox doctrine having been set forth, the Synod rejects the errors of those,

1. Who teach that 'It cannot properly be said, that 'original sin (*peccatum originis*) suffices of itself for the con-'demnation of the whole human race, or the desert of tem-'poral and eternal punishments:' For they contradict the apostle, who says, Rom. v. 12. "By one man sin entered "into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed "upon all men, for that all have sinned." And ver. 16. "By one man the offence entered unto condemnation." Also, Rom. vi. 23. "The wages of sin is death."†

2. Who teach that 'Spiritual gifts, or good habits and 'virtues, such as kindness, sanctity, and justice, could have

* Let the candid reader compare carefully the seventeen articles above given, with these two abbreviated articles, and then judge for himself, whether such a reporter deserves even the least credit or confidence.

† 'Original sin is so base and execrable, that it suffices to the con-'demnation of the whole human race.' Belgick Confession, Art. xv. 'God saw that man had so cast himself into the condemnation of death, 'both corporeal and spiritual, and was made altogether miserable and 'accursed.' Ibid. Art. xvii. 'In every person born into the world, it 'deserveth God's wrath and damnation.' Art. ix. Church of England.

'no place in the will of man when he was first created, and 'therefore, neither in the fall, could they be separated from 'it.' For this opposes (*pugnat eum*) the description of the image of God, which the apostle states in Eph. iv. 24. where he describes it (as consisting) "in righteousness and "holiness," which have a place in the will altogether.

3. Who teach that 'Spiritual gifts are not separated from 'the will of man in spiritual death, as it (the will) never 'was corrupted in itself, but only impeded by the darkness 'of the mind, and the irregularity of the affections; which 'impediments being removed, it may be able to exert the 'free power planted (*insitam*) in it; that is, it might of 'itself will or choose, or not will or choose, whatever good 'was proposed to it.' This is new and erroneous; even so far as it causes the power of free-will to be exalted, against the words of the prophet, Jeremiah xvii. 9. "The heart is de-"ceitful above all things and perverse:" and the apostle, Eph. ii. 3. "Among whom (contumacious men) we all had "our conversation in times past, in the lusts of our flesh, "fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the thoughts."*

4. Who teach that 'Man unregenerate is neither properly 'nor totally dead in sins, or destitute of all power for what 'is spiritually good; but that he can hunger and thirst after 'righteousness or life, and offer the sacrifice of a broken and 'contrite spirit, which is accepted by God:' For these things are contrary to the open testimonies of Scripture, Ephes. ii. 14. "Ye were dead in trespasses and sins." And

* 'The apostle says, that "it is God, who worketh in us, both "that we should will, and that we should do, of his own free "benevolence;" for no mind, no will, acquiesces in the will of God, 'in which Christ himself hath not first operated.' Belgick Confession, Art. xiv. 'We have no power to do good works, pleasant and ac-'ceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, 'that we may have a good will; and working with us, when we have 'that good will.' Art. x. Church of England.

Gen. vi. 5. and viii. 21. "The imagination of the thoughts "of man's heart is only evil continually." Moreover, to hunger and thirst after deliverance from misery, and for life—and to offer unto God, the sacrifice of a contrite spirit, is the part of the regenerate, and of those who are said to be blessed. Ps. li. 19. 1 Chron. xxix. 14. Matt. v. 6.

5. Who teach that 'Man, corrupt, animal, (ψυχικος) can 'so rightly use common grace, which in them is the light 'of nature, and the gifts remaining after the fall, that by 'this good use he may obtain greater grace, for instance, 'evangelical or saving, and gradually may obtain salvation 'itself: And on this account God hath shewed himself 'ready, on his part, to reveal Christ to all, seeing that he 'administers to all, sufficiently and efficaciously, the necessary 'means to the revelation of Christ, faith and repentance.' For, besides the experience of all ages, this is testified to be false by the Scripture: Ps. cxlvii. 19, 20. "He sheweth "his words unto Jacob, his statutes and laws unto Israel: "he hath not done so unto any other people, neither have "they known his laws." Acts xvi. 16. "God permitted in "past ages all the nations to walk in their own ways." Acts xvi. 6, 7. "They were forbidden (Paul and his compa- "nions) by the Holy Ghost to preach the word of God in "Asia." And, "When they were come into Mysia, they "endeavoured to go towards Bithynia, but the Spirit suf- "fered them not."*

* The matter of fact, that all those, who enjoy the means of grace in the greatest abundance, do not profit by them; is as undeniable, as that all nations are not favoured with the means of grace: but to speak of those things as *sufficient* and *efficacious*, which in the case of a vast majority prove *insufficient* and *inefficacious*, must surely be unreasonable; especially as to them the Gospel itself proves "a savour of "death unto death." That "Paul may plant and Apollos may water," but that God alone can give "the increase," is most manifest to those, who have the deepest experience, and have made the most accurate and long-continued observation, on the event of the wisest, most loving,

6. Who teach, that 'In the true conversion of man, 'there cannot be new qualities, habits, or gifts, infused by 'God into his will: and so faith, by which we are first 'converted, and from which we are called the faithful, is 'not a quality or gift infused by God; but only an act of 'man, nor can it be otherwise called a gift, than with 'respect to the power of attaining it.' For these contradict the holy Scriptures, which testify that God doth infuse new qualities of faith, obedience, and a sense of his love into our hearts. Jer. xxxi. 33. "I will put my law into "their mind and will write it in their heart." Isa. xliv. 3. "I will pour water on him that is a-thirst, and rivers upon "the dry ground; I will pour out my Spirit on thy seed." Rom. v. 5. "The love of God which is shed abroad in our "hearts by the Holy Spirit which is given to us." They also contradict the constant practice of the church, according to the prophet, praying—"Convert thou me, and I "shall be converted." Jer. xxxi. 18, 19. (Ez. xi. 19, 20. xxxvi. 25—27. Eph. i. 19, 20, ii. 8—10.)

7. Who teach, 'That the grace, by which we are con-'verted to God, is nothing else than gentle suasion; or (as 'others explain it) the most noble method of acting in the

and most scriptural instructions. 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7.—Enough has been quoted from the Belgick Confession to shew that this error was as contrary to that document, as to any article of the Synod of Dort.—'The con-'dition of man after the fall of Adam, is such, that he cannot turn or 'prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to *faith* 'and calling upon God.' 'Works done before the grace of Christ, and 'the inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God; forasmuch as 'they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ; neither do they make men 'meet to receive grace, or (as the school authors say) deserve grace of 'congruity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed 'and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the 'nature of sin.' Art. x. xiii. Ch. of Eng.—He, who is well versed in this controversy, is aware, that the doctrine here condemned, comprises the very hinge, on which the whole turns: if *false*, Calvinists (in the modern use of the word) are right; if *true*, Anti-calvinists are right.

'conversion of man, and the most suitable *(convenientissi-*
'*mum)* to human nature, is that which is done by suasions,
'and that nothing hinders that moral grace alone should
'render animal *(natural,* ψυχικον*)* men spiritual; indeed God
'produces the consent of the will no otherwise than by
'moral reason; and the efficacy of divine grace, by which
'he overcomes the operation of Satan, consists in this, 'that
'God promises eternal benefits, and Satan temporal ones.'
For this is altogether Pelagian, and contrary to the whole
Scripture, which, besides this, acknowledges also another,
and far more effectual and divine mode of acting of the
Holy Spirit in man's conversion. Ezek. xxxvi. 26. "I will
"give you a new heart, and I will put a new spirit within
"you; and I will take away the heart of stone and give
"you a heart of flesh, &c."—"Except a man be born
"again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." John iii. 3—6.
"The natural man (ψυχικος) receiveth not the things of the
"Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they
"are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. ii. 14.

8. Who teach that 'God does not apply those powers
'of his own omnipotence in the regeneration of man, by
'which he mightily and infallibly bends his will to faith
'and conversion; but all the operations of grace having
'been employed *(positis)* which God makes use of in
'man's conversion, man nevertheless can so resist God and
'the Spirit, intending his regeneration and willing to rege-
'nerate him, and in very deed *(ipso actu)* often doth so
'resist, as entirely to hinder his own regeneration, and thus
'it remains in his own power, whether he will be regene-
'rated or not.' For this is no other than taking away all
the efficacy of God's grace in our conversion, and subjecting
the act of Almighty God to the will of man, and contradicts
the apostles, who teach that "We believe through the effi-
"cacy of the mighty power of God." Ephes. i. 19. and

that "God fills up in us the good pleasure of his goodness, "and the work of faith with power." 2 Thess. i. 11. *Also*, that "His divine power hath given us all things which "pertain to life and godliness." 2 Pet. i. 3. "Thy people "shall be willing in the day of thy power." "It is God "that worketh in us both to will and to do." The want of the willing mind is the grand thing wanting, and *until this* is wrought in us, we "do always resist the Holy Ghost." Ps. cx. 4. Phil. i. 13.

9. Who teach that 'Grace and free-will are partial causes 'concurring at the same time, to the beginning of conver-'sion; nor doth grace, in the order of causality, precede 'the efficacy of the will: that is, God does not effectually 'help the will of man to conversion, before the will of man 'moves and determines itself.' For this dogma the ancient church long ago condemned in Pelagians, from the apostle, Rom. ix. 16. "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him "that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy." And 1 Cor. iv. 7. "Who maketh thee to differ? And what hast "thou that thou didst not receive?" Also, Phil. ii. 13. "It "is God who worketh in you this very thing, to will and "to do of his good pleasure."*

* 'Almighty God, we humbly beseech thee, that, as by thy *special* '*grace preventing us*, thou dost put into our minds good desires, so, &c.' (Collect East. Sund. Ch. Eng.)

CHAPTER V, OF DOCTRINE.

Concerning the Perseverance of the Saints.

1. Those whom God, according to his purpose, calleth to the fellowship of his Son our Lord Jesus Christ, and regenerates by the Holy Spirit, he indeed sets free from the dominion and slavery of sin, but not entirely in this life from the flesh and the body of sin.*

2. Hence daily sins of infirmity arise, and blemishes (*nævi*) cleave to the best works even of the saints; which furnish to them continual cause (*materiam*) of humbling themselves before God, of fleeing to Christ crucified, of mortifying the flesh more and more by the spirit of prayers, and the holy exercises of piety, and of panting after the goal of perfection (*ad perfectionis metam suspirandi*) until the time when, delivered from this body of death, they shall reign with the Lamb of God in the heavens.†

3. Because of these remains of in-dwelling sin, and

* They who constitute the true church; 'such a mark of them 'is the faith, by which Christ, or their only Saviour, being apprehended, 'they flee from sin and follow after righteousness; at the same time, 'they love the true God and their neighbours, neither turning aside to 'the right hand nor to the left: they crucify the flesh with its affections; 'but by no means this indeed, as if there were not in them any longer in-'firmity: but that they fight against it through the whole time of their 'life, by the energy (*virtutem*) of the Holy Spirit; and in the mean time 'they flee to the blood, the death, and the sufferings and obedience of 'our Lord Christ, as to their most safe protection.' Belgick Confession, Art. xxix. Rom. vii. 21—25. viii. 1, 2. Gal. v. 16, 17. 24. See Art. ix. Ch. Eng.—The Remonstrants or Arminians of those days held, it seems, the doctrine of sinless perfection in this life more *generally* than Anti-calvinists do at present.

† 'Not that they should slumber, trusting in this remission, but that 'the feeling of this corruption may excite in the faithful more frequent 'groans; and that they may wish more ardently to be freed from this body 'of death. Rom. vii. 18. 24.' Belgick Confession, Art. xv.

moreover also, the temptations of the world and of Satan, the converted could not continue (*perstare*) in this grace, if they were left to their own strength. But God is faithful, who confirms them in the grace once mercifully conferred on them, and powerfully preserves them in the same even unto the end.*

4. But though that power of God, confirming the truly faithful (*verè fideles*) in grace, and preserving them, is greater than what can be overcome by the flesh; yet the converted are not always so influenced and moved by God, that they cannot depart, in certain particular actions, from the leading of grace, and be seduced by the desires (*concupiscentiis*) of the flesh, and obey them. Wherefore, they must continually watch and pray, lest they should be led into temptations. Which when they do not, they may be not only violently carried away by the flesh, and the world, and Satan, unto grievous and atrocious sins; but they are sometimes even thus violently carried away, by the righteous permission of God; which the mournful falls of David and Peter, and of other saints recorded in scripture, demonstrate.†

5. But by such enormous sins they exceedingly offend God: they incur the guilt of death, they grieve the Holy Spirit, they interrupt the exercise of faith, they most grievously wound conscience, and they sometimes lose, for a time, the perception of grace; until by serious repentance, returning into the way, the paternal countenance of God again shines upon them.‡

6. For God, who is rich in mercy, from his immutable purpose of election, does not wholly take away his Holy Spirit from his own, even in lamentable falls; nor does he

* Prov. xxviii. 26. Jer. xvii. 9. Luke xxii. 31, 32. 1 Pet. i. 5.

† Ps. cxix. 116, 117. Matt. xxvi. 40, 41. 69—75. 1 Pet. v. 8. Jude 20, 21. 24.

‡ Ps. li. 11, 12.

so permit them to glide down, *(prolabi,)* that they should fall from the grace of adoption and the state of justification, or commit the sin unto death, or against the Holy Spirit; that, being deserted by him, they should cast themselves headlong into eternal destruction.*

7. In the first place, he preserves in them, in these falls, that immortal seed, by which they are regenerated, *(or begotten again, regeniti,)* lest it should perish, or be shaken out.† Then, by his own word and Spirit, he assuredly and efficaciously renews them to repentance; that from the soul they may mourn according to God, for the sins committed; may seek remission in the blood of the Mediator by faith, with a contrite heart, and obtain it; that they may feel the favour of God again reconciled; may adore his mercies by faith; and finally work out their salvation more earnestly with fear and trembling.‡

8. So that, not by their own merits or strength, but by the gratuitous mercy of God they obtain it, that they neither totally fall from faith and grace, nor finally continue in their falls and perish. Which as to themselves *(quoad ipsos)* not only might easily be done, but would without doubt be done; yet, in respect of God, it cannot at all be done, *(or take place, fieri,)* as, neither can his counsel be changed, his promise fall, their vocation according to his purpose be recalled, the merit, intercession, and guardianship of Christ be rendered void, nor the sealing of the Holy Spirit become vain, or be blotted out.§

* Luke xxii. 32. John iv. 14. 1 John v. 16—18.

† 1 Pet. i. 23. 1 John iii. 9.

‡ Can any thing be guarded in a more wise, holy, and scriptural manner, than this statement of the means, by which God preserves and restores his offending children? Ps. lxxxix. 30—34. Jer. xxxii. 40. 1 Cor. xi. 32. Matt. xxvi. 75. John xxi. 17. 1 Pet. iv. 7. v. 8.

§ John x. 27—30. xiii. 36. xiv. 19. xvii. 24. Rom. v. 9, 10. viii. 16, 17. 28—39. 2 Cor. i. 2. Eph. i. 13, 14. v. 30.

9. Of this guarding of the elect to salvation, and the perseverance in the faith of the truly faithful, (*vere fidelium,*) the faithful themselves may become certain, (*assured*) and are, according to the measure of their faith; by which they certainly believe themselves to be, and that they shall perpetually remain, true and living members of the church, have remission of sins, and eternal life.*

10. And indeed, (truly, *proinde,*) this certainly is not from any peculiar revelation, made beyond, or without, the word of God; but from the belief of the promises, which God hath most copiously revealed in his own word, for our comfort; by the testimony "of the Holy Spirit witnessing "with our spirit, that we are the sons and heirs of God." (Rom. viii. 16.) Finally, from the earnest (or *serious, serio*) and holy desire (*or pursuit, studio*) of a good conscience and good works.† And of this substantial consolation of the victory to be obtained, and the infallible earnest of eternal glory, if the Elect of God could be deprived "in this world, they would of all men be the "most miserable."

11. In the mean while, the scripture testifies, that the faithful in this life, are assaulted (*conflictari*) with various doubtings of the flesh, and, being placed in heavy temptations, do not always feel this full assurance of faith and certainty of perseverance. But God, "the Father of all "consolation," does not suffer them to be tempted above "their strength, but with the temptation makes some way "of escape" (*præstat evasionem,* ποιησει—εκβασιν). And, by

* *May become certain,* not, are *all of them,* or *at all times, certain.* Heb. vi. 10, 11. 2 Pet. i. 10, 11. 1 John v. 11—13. 19, 20.

† Surely this has the stamp of holiness deeply impressed upon it! It is evangelical truth, in that part of it, which is most vehemently accused as tending to laxity of practice, and most frequently mistated by the injudicious, and perverted by enthusiasts and hypocrites, set forth in its genuine and inseparable connection with good works. 1 Cor. xv. 58.

the Holy Spirit, he excites again in the same persons the certainty of perseverance.

12. But so far is this certainty of perseverance from rendering the truly faithful proud and carnally secure, that, on the contrary, it is the true root of humility, of filial reverential fear, of true piety, of patience in every conflict, of ardent prayers, of constancy in the cross, and in the confession of the truth, and of solid joy in God: and the consideration of this benefit is the spur *(stimulus)* to the serious and continual exercise of gratitude and good works; as it appears by the testimonies of the scriptures, and the examples of the saints.

13. Neither even in those, who are reinstated after a fall, doth the renewed confidence of perseverance produce licentiousness, or neglect *(incuriam)* of piety, but much greater care of solicitously being guarded (or kept) in the ways of God, which are prepared, that by walking in them they may retain the certainty of their own perseverance: lest, on account of the abuse of his paternal benignity, the face of the merciful God, (the contemplation of which is to the pious sweeter than life, and the withdrawing of it more bitter than death,) should again be turned away from them, and so they should fall into heavier torments of the soul.*

14. But, as it hath pleased God to begin this work in us by the preaching of the gospel; so, by the hearing, reading, meditation of the same, by exhortations, threatenings, promises, and moreover by the use of the sacraments, he preserves, continues, and perfects it.†

* Ps. lxxxv. 8.

† Is not this a full confutation of those who accuse such as hold this doctrine, with rendering all means of grace needless, and all exhortations nugatory? The means to be used by the persons themselves, and by others for them, in whatever form they are employed, constitute a

15. This doctrine, concerning the perseverance of the truly believing and saints, and of its certainty, which God hath abundantly revealed in his word,' to the glory of his own name and to the comfort of pious souls, and hath impressed on the hearts of the faithful, the flesh indeed doth not receive, Satan hates, the world derides, the inexperienced *(imperiti)* and hypocrites violently hurry away *(rapiunt,)* into abuse, and the spirits of error oppose.—But the spouse of Christ hath always most tenderly loved it, as a treasure of inestimable value, and hath constantly defended it *(propugnavit)*, which indeed that she may do God will take care *(procurabit)*, against whom neither counsel can avail, nor any strength succeed. To whom, the only God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

These fifteen articles are abbreviated, as has been above stated, in the following article.

Art. V. *Of the Certainty of Perseverance.*

'That such as have once received that grace by faith, 'can never fall from it, finally or totally, notwithstanding 'the most enormous sins they can commit.

To which is added, 'This is the shortest, and withal the 'most favourable summary, which I have hitherto met with 'of the conclusions of this Synod: that which was drawn up 'by the Remonstrants in their antidotum, being much more 'large, and comprehending many things by way of inference, 'which are not positively expressed in the words themselves.'

I am not able to annex the *Antidotum* of the Remon-

part of that counsel and plan, by which God preserves his people, and causes them 'to walk religiously in good works, and at length by his 'mercy they attain to everlasting felicity.' Art. xvii. Ch. Eng. Compare Acts xxvii. 22—24. with 31. and Jude 20, 21. with 24.

strants: yet, I cannot but be disposed to think, that it does not contain a more unfavourable statement of the conclusions made by the Synod of Dort, than that abbreviated in these five articles, though doubtless, it is more prolix. But would not the very articles published by the Synod itself, being produced or commented on, have been far more like a *fair* and equitable conduct towards it, than any *abbreviation*, or *antidotum*, drawn up by its avowed opponents? I trust such would have been the conduct of most Calvinists, in recording the proceedings of an Anti-calvinistick Synod: but, it seems, Calvinists are exceptions to all rules, and have no right to expect fair and equitable treatment from other men.

Rejection of Errors on the Fifth Chapter, concerning the Doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints.

The orthodox doctrine having been set forth, the Synod rejects the errors of those,

1. Who teach that 'The perseverance of the truly 'faithful is not the effect of election, or the gift of God ob-'tained by the death of Christ, but a condition of the new 'covenant, to be performed by man, of free-will, antecedent 'to his *peremptory* election and justification, as they them-'selves speak.' For, the sacred scripture testifies, that it follows election, and that it is given to the elect, through the power of the death, resurrection, and intercession of Christ. Rom. xi. 7. "The election have obtained; the "rest were hardened." (πωρωθησαν) Also, Rom. viii. 32. "He who spared not his own Son, but delivered him up "for us all, how shall he not with him freely give us all "things? Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's "elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that con-

"demneth? It is Christ who died; yea, rather who is "risen again, who also sitteth at the right hand of God, "who likewise intercedeth for us: Who shall separate us "from the love of Christ?"*

2. Who teach that 'God indeed provides the believer, 'with powers sufficient for persevering, and is ready to pre-'serve them in him if he performs his duty: all things, how-'ever, being furnished which are necessary to persevering 'in faith, and which God willeth to supply for the pre-'servation of faith, it always depends upon the freedom of 'the will whether he will persevere, or not persevere:' For this opinion contains manifest Pelagianism; and, while it willeth to make men *free*, makes them sacrilegious, contrary to the perpetual agreement of the evangelical doctrine, which deprives men of all ground (*materiam*) for glorying, and ascribes to divine grace alone the praise of this benefit; and it is opposite to the apostle, who declares, that "It is God "who will confirm us even to the end blameless, in the "day of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. i. 8.†

3. Who teach that 'True believers and regenerate persons 'may not only fall from justifying faith, and in like manner 'from grace and salvation, totally and finally, but likewise 'that in fact (*re ipsa*) they not seldom do fall from it, and 'perish eternally:' For this opinion renders vain the grace itself of justification and regeneration, and the perpetual guardian care (*custodiam*) of Christ, contrary to the expressive words of the apostle Paul, Rom. v. 8, 9. "If Christ died for

* Luke xxii. 32. 1 Pet. i. 5. 'Because the frailty of man without 'thee cannot but fall, keep us ever by thy help from all things hurtful.' Col. xv. after Trinity, Church of England.

† "Being confident of this, that he who hath begun a good work "in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." Phil. i. 6. If it depend absolutely on the freedom of man's will, whether he will persevere or not, his reliance must and ought to be placed on that, on which the whole event depends; and is not this to trust our own hearts?

"us while we were yet sinners, much more therefore, being "now justified through his blood, we shall be saved from "wrath by him." And, contrary to the apostle John, 1 John iii. 9. "Every one that is born of God doth not "commit sin, because his seed remaineth in him: neither "can he sin, because he is born of God." Also, contrary to the words of Jesus Christ, John x. 28, 29. "I give "eternal life to my sheep, and they shall never perish, "neither shall any one tear them violently out of my hand: "my Father who gave them me is greater than all, neither "can any one tear them violently out of my Father's hand."

4. Who teach that 'True believers and the regenerate 'may sin the sin unto death, or against the Holy Spirit.' But the same apostle, John, chap. v. after, in the 16th and 17th verses, he has mentioned those who sin unto death, and forbidden to pray for them, immediately, ver. 18. adds, "We "know, that whosoever is born of God, sinneth not," (namely, in that kind of sin) "but he that is born of God, keepeth "himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not."

5. Who teach that 'No certainty of future perseverance 'can be had in this life, without special revelation.' For, by this doctrine, solid consolation is taken away from true believers in this life, and the doubting of the papists (*pontificorum*) brought back into the church. But the holy scripture every where requires this certainty, not from special and extraordinary revelation, but from the peculiar marks of the children of God, and the most constant promises of God. In the first place, the apostle Paul, Rom. viii. 39. "No created thing can separate us from the love of God, "which is in Christ Jesus our Lord," and 1 John iii. 24. "Whoso keepeth his commandment remaineth in him, and "he in him; and hereby we know that we remain in him "by the Spirit which he hath given us."*

* 1 John ii. 3, 4. iii. 14. 18, 19. Not a single instance can be adduced from the scripture, in which any prophet or apostle ascribes his

6. Who teach that 'The doctrine of perseverance and 'the assurance of salvation, from its nature and tendency, '(*indole*) is a pillow for the flesh, and injurious to piety, 'good conduct, prayers, and other holy exercises; but that 'on the contrary to doubt concerning it is laudable:' For these persons shew themselves to be ignorant of the efficacy of divine grace, and of the operation of the in-dwelling Holy Spirit: and they contradict the apostle John affirming in express words, 1 John iii. 2, 3. "Beloved, now are we "the sons of God; but it doth not yet appear what we "shall be: we know, however, that when he shall be re-"vealed, we shall be like him, because we shall see him "as he is. And whoso hath this hope in him, purifieth "himself, even as he is pure." They are moreover, confuted by the examples of the saints in the Old as well as in the New Testament, who, though they were certain of their own perseverance and salvation, were nevertheless assiduous in prayers, and other pious exercises.

7. Who teach that 'The faith of temporary believers 'doth not differ from justifying and saving faith, except 'in duration alone:' For Christ himself, Matt. xiii. 20. and Luke viii. 13, &c, besides this, manifestly constituted a threefold distinction between temporary, and true believers, as he says, *those* received the seed in stony ground, *these* in good ground, or "an honest heart:" *those* are without root; *these* have a firm root: *those* are destitute of fruit, *these* bring forth their fruit in divers measure, constantly or perseveringly.*

own assurance of salvation to special revelation, or to any thing different from what he exhorts others to, in order to obtain and retain the same assurance. This concludes at least as strongly against those, who ground their assurance on dreams, visions, and impressions, of whatever kind; as those who say, it can only be enjoyed by immediate revelation.

* "The foolish virgins took their lamps but *no oil* with them. The "wise, took *oil* in their vessels, with their lamps." Matt. xxv. 4, 5. 1 John ii. 19.

8. Who teach that 'it is not absurd, that the first re-'generation being extinct, man should be again, yea, more 'often regenerated:'* For by this doctrine they deny the incorruptibility of the seed of God, by which we are born again; contrary to the testimony of the apostle, 1 Pet. i. 23. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of in-"corruptible."

8. Who teach that 'Christ doth in no wise pray for the 'infallible perseverance in faith of believers:' For they contradict Christ himself, who says, Luke xxii. 32. "I have "prayed for thee (Peter) that thy faith fail not," and John the evangelist, testifying, John xvii. 20. that Christ prayed, not only for the apostles, but likewise for all who shall believe through their words: ver. 11. "Holy Father, keep "them through thy name:" and ver. 15. "I pray not that "thou mayest take them out of the world, but that thou "shouldest keep them from evil."

CONCLUSION.

And this is a perspicuous, simple, and ingenuous declaration of the orthodox doctrine concerning the five controverted articles in Belgium, and a rejection of the errors by which the Belgick churches have for some time been disturbed, which the Synod, having taken from the word of God, judges to be agreeable to the confessions of the reformed churches. Whence it clearly appears, that they, whom it by no means became, purposed to inculcate on the people, those (articles) which are contrary to all truth, equity, and charity.

* This is a ground, that modern opposers of the doctrine not only disclaim, but charge it erroneously as an error, which the Calvinists maintain.

(Namely,) That the doctrine of the reformed churches, 'concerning predestination, and the heads connected with it, '(*annexis ei*) by its own proper nature (*genio*) and impulse, 'draws away the minds of men from all piety and religion;* 'that is the pillow of the flesh and of the devil, the citadel 'of Satan, from which he lies in ambush (*insidietur*) for 'all, wounds very many, and fatally pierces through many, 'as well with javelins of desperation as of security: That 'the same doctrine makes God the author of sin, unjust, 'a tyrant, a hypocrite; nor is it any other than interpolated 'Stoicism, Manicheism, Libertinism, and Turcism (*Tur-'cismum*):† That it renders men secure, as being persuaded, 'that it does not hinder the salvation of the elect, in what 'manner soever they live; and they can with safety per-'petrate the most atrocious crimes; That it does not profit 'the reprobate, as to salvation, if they should truly do all 'the works of the saints: That by the same (doctrine) it is 'taught, that God by the bare and mere determination (*nudo 'puroque arbitrio*) of his will, without any respect, views

* Two things clearly appear from this passage, 1. The Remonstrants assumed it as undoubted, that the predestination which they opposed with its connected heads of doctrine, was generally held by the reformed churches, including the church of England. And, 2. They injuriously charged it with involving those very consequences, which they who contend that the church of England is not Calvinistick, charge on the doctrine of those whom they call Calvinists.

† The chapter in the 'Refutation of Calvinism,' shewing 'that the 'earliest heretics maintained opinions greatly resembling the peculiar 'tenets of Calvinism;' comes far short it seems of the charges brought by the Remonstrants against the doctrine of predestination, as held by the reformed churches including that of England among the rest. That doctrine, as held in these churches, was not only Manicheism, but heathen Stoicism, infidel Libertinism, and Mohammedism. But it is far more easy to bring accusations against any tenet or body of men, than satisfactorily to prove them. The Synod of Dort did not at all shrink from proclaiming, that such charges had been brought; and they were satisfied, and on good ground, that they had fully demonstrated them to be unfounded.

'(*intuitu*) of the sin of any man, predestinated and created 'the greatest part of the world to eternal damnation: That 'in the same manner as election is the fountain and cause 'of faith and good works, reprobation is the cause of in-'fidelity and impiety: That many unoffending (*innoxiæ*) 'infants of believers are violently torn away from the breasts 'of their mothers, and tyrannically precipitated into hell; 'so that neither baptism, nor the prayers of the church at 'their baptism, profit them.'*

Also those very many other things that are of the same kind, which the reformed churches not only do not acknowledge, but which they detest with their whole soul (*pectore*). Wherefore, this Synod of Dordrecht, obtests by the name of the Lord, all as many as piously call on the name of our Saviour Jesus Christ, that they would judge concerning the faith of the reformed churches, not from the calumnies heaped together from this and the other quarter (*hinc inde*,) nor even from the private sayings of certain individuals, as well ancient as modern doctors quoted often either unfaithfully, or wrested (*detortis*) into a foreign meaning; but from the publick confessions of those churches, and from this declaration of the orthodox doctrine, confirmed by the unanimous consent of all, and every one of, the members of this whole Synod. It then (*deinde*) seriously admonishes the calumniators themselves, to consider how heavy a judgment of God, they may be about to suffer, who, against so many churches, against so many confessions of churches, bear false witness, disturb the consciences of the weak, and

* The language of these accusations is so horridly irreverend, that if it had not been actually used by the Remonstrants, it could hardly have been thus brought forward; and nothing but to shew the real spirit of these controversialists, could excuse the repeating of it, either by the Synod, or in this publication.

diligently employ themselves (*satagunt*) to render the society of true believers suspected.*

Lastly, this Synod exhorts all their fellow ministers in the gospel of Christ, that in the treating (*pertractione*) of this doctrine, they would walk piously and religiously in the schools and in the churches; and apply it, whether by tongue or pen, to the glory of the divine name, to holiness of life, and to the consolation of alarmed souls, that they may not only think, but speak, with the scripture, according to the analogy of faith: finally, that they would abstain from all those phrases which exceed the prescribed limits of the genuine sense of the holy scriptures, and that might afford a just handle to perverse sophists of reviling, or even calumniating the reformed churches. May Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who, sitting at the right hand of the Father, bestows gifts on men, sanctify us in truth; lead those to the truth who err; shut the mouths of those who calumniate the holy doctrine; and endow the faithful ministers of his word, with a spirit of wisdom and discretion, that all their eloquence may tend to the glory of God and the edification of the hearers. Amen.†

THE DECISION OF THE SYNOD CONCERNING THE REMONSTRANTS.

The truth, having been, by the grace of God, thus far explained and asserted, errors rejected and condemned, and

* This solemn warning is quite as seasonable in Britain at present, as it was in Belgium in the seventeenth century.

† Can any thing be more wise, pious, and scriptural, than this concluding counsel and prayer? Who can deny, that many called Calvinists, by neglecting the counsel here exhibited, have given much occasion of misapprehension, prejudice, and slander to opposers, which might have been avoided? Who can object to this counsel? What pious mind will refuse to add his hearty Amen, to the closing prayer?

iniquitous calumnies refuted: this Synod of Dort, (according to the duty which is farther incumbent upon it) seriously, earnestly, and by the authority, which, according to the word of God, it possesses over all the members of its churches, in the name of Christ, beseeches, exhorts, admonishes, and enjoins all and every one, of the pastors of the churches in confederated Belgium; the doctors and rectors of the academies and schools; and the magistrates, and indeed all universally, to whom, either the care of souls, or the discipline of youth is committed, that, casting away the five known articles of the Remonstrants, which are erroneous, and mere hiding places of errors, they will preserve this wholesome doctrine of saving truth, drawn from the most pure fountain of the divine word, sincere and inviolate; according to their ability and office, propound and explain it faithfully to the people and youth; and diligently declare its most sweet and beneficial use in life, as well as in death: that they instruct those of different sentiments, those who wander from the flock, and are led away by the novelty of opinions, meekly by the evidence of the truth, "if peradventure, God "will give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the "truth:" that, restored to a sound mind, they may with one spirit, one mouth, one faith and charity, return to the church of God and the communion of the saints: and that at length, the wound of the church may be closed, and all her members be of one heart and mind in the Lord.

But moreover, because some persons having gone out from among us, under the title of Remonstrants, (which name of Remonstrants, as also of Contra-Remonstrants, the Synod thinks should be blotted out by a perpetual oblivion;) and the discipline and order of the church having been violated, by their endeavours and private counsels in unlawful ways; and the admonitions and judgments of their brethren having been despised; they have grievously, and altogether danger-

ously disturbed the Belgick churches, before most flourishing, and most united in faith and love, and in these heads of doctrine: have recalled ancient and pernicious errors, and framed new ones: and publickly and privately, both by word and by writings, have scattered them among the common people, and have most vehemently contended for them; have made neither measure nor end, of enveighing against the doctrine hitherto received in the churches, by enormous calumnies and reproaches: have filled all things every where, with scandals, dissensions, scruples of consciences, and inventions (*excogitationibus*); which great crimes certainly against faith, against love, and good morals, and the unity and peace of the churches, as they could not justly be endured in any man, ought necessarily to be animadverted on, in pastors, with that most severe censure, which hath in every age (*ab omni ævo*) been adopted by the church: the Synod having invoked the holy name of God, and honestly conscious of its authority from the word of God; treading in the footsteps as well of ancient as of recent Synods, and fortified by the authority of the most Illustrious the States General, declares and judges, that those pastors, who have yielded themselves leaders of parties in the church, and teachers of errors, and of a corrupt religion, and of the rended unity of the church, and of most grievous scandals, and moreover, having been summoned before this Synod, of intolerable obstinacy against the decrees of the supreme authority made known by this Synod, and also against the venerable Synod itself, be accounted convicted and guilty persons.

For which causes, in the first place, the Synod interdicts the before cited persons from every ecclesiastical service, and abdicates them from their offices, and judges them even to be unworthy of academical functions, until by earnest repentance, abundantly proved by words and deeds, and contrary exertions, they satisfy the church, and be truly

and fully reconciled with the same, and received to her communion; which for their own good, and for the joy of the whole church, we peculiarly (*unice*) desire in Christ our Lord. But the rest, of whom the knowledge hath not come to this national Synod, the Synod commits to the Provincials, the Classes, and the Presbyteries, after the received order; that they may take care that the church at present receive no detriment, nor fear it hereafter. Let them discriminate with the spirit of prudence the followers of these errors: Let them abdicate the refractory, the clamorous, the factious, the disturbers, as soon as possible, from ecclesiastical offices, and those of the schools which belong to their knowledge and care: and let them be admonished that, without any interposed delay, after the reception of the decision of this national Synod, having obtained the authority of the magistrate, in order to it, they assemble (for this purpose) lest the evil should increase and be strengthened by delay. Let them, with all lenity, by the duties of love, by patience, excite those, who have fallen or been carried away, by infirmity and the fault of the times, and perhaps hesitate in lighter matters, or are even dissentient, but quiet, of blameless life, tractable, to true and perfect concord with the church: yet so, that they may diligently take care that they do not admit any to the sacred ministry, who refuse to subscribe these synodical constitutions of the declared doctrine, and to teach it: that they even retain no one, by whose manifest dissention the doctrine approved with such agreement in this Synod may be violated, and the tranquillity of the churches again disturbed.

Moreover, this venerable Synod seriously admonishes all ecclesiastical assemblies, most diligently to watch over the flocks committed to them, and maturely to go and meet all innovations privily springing up in the church, and pull them up, as it were tares, out of the field of the Lord: that

they attend to the schools, and the conductors (*moderatoribus*) of schools, lest any things, from private sentiments and depraved opinions, having been instilled into the youth, destruction should afterwards be produced to the church and the republick.

Finally, thanks having been reverently given to the most Illustrious and very powerful the States General of Belgium, because they in so necessary and seasonable a time, clemently gave succour to the afflicted and declining interests of the church, by the remedy of the Synod; that they received the upright and faithful servants of God under their protection, and willed that the pledge of every blessing and the divine presence, the truth of his word should be, in a holy and religious manner, preserved in their dominions; that they spared no labour or expence, to promote and complete such a work; for which extraordinary benefits, the Synod, with its whole heart, prays for the most abundant recompence on them from the Lord, both publickly and privately, both spiritual and temporal. And the Synod indeed most strenuously and humbly asketh the same most clement lords, to will and command that this salutary doctrine, most faithfully expressed according to the word of God, and the consent of the reformed churches, be alone, and publickly heard in these regions; to drive away all privily springing up heresies and errors, and repress unquiet and turbulent spirits, that they would go to approve themselves the true and benign nursing fathers and tutors of the church; that they would determine that the sentence, according to the ecclesiastical authority confirmed by the laws of the country, be valid against the persons before spoken of; and that they would render the Synodical constitutions immoveable and perpetual, by the addition of their own decision (*calculo*).

On this conclusion a few remarks may be useful.

Conceding, that there were things unjustifiable in the decisions made, and the measures adopted by the Synod, I would enquire, whether all the blame in the whole of that lamentable contest, was on one side? Whether the conduct of the Remonstrants were not as remote at least from a conciliatory spirit, as the members of the Synod? And whether, in case the Remonstrants had been victorious, they would have made a more Christian use of their victory and authority than the Synod did? I never yet knew or read of an eager and pertinacious contest, in which both parties were not greatly culpable; and in many instances, it is not easy for an impartial observer to determine on which side the greatest degree of criminality rests: only where other motives or prejudices do not counteract, the suffering party is generally favoured and excused; and still more, when the motives, sentiments, or prejudices of the persons concerned are on his side. The Remonstrants, and all who ever since have favoured them, throw the whole blame of the contest, both of the management, result, and consequences of it, on the Synod; and as the Remonstrants were, in the first instance at least, the chief sufferers, and as their tenets are generally more favoured than those of the Synod, the publick mind has greatly favoured the cause of the suffering party. Yet the Synod and its supporters seem very confident, that the Remonstrants exclusively were in fault, and consider their conduct as intolerably haughty and pertinacious. But will not an impartial judge, would not one, who had no sympathy with either party, no partiality or prejudice, as to the five points of doctrine, on either side, (if such a man can be found on earth,) would he not fairly divide the criminality? At least would he not allot nearly one half of it to the one, and one half to the other? Nay, might he not allot the greater part to the Remonstrants? Thus, in all other contests,

which have terminated in incurable separations, the charge of schism has been brought with the utmost confidence (if not bitterness) by each party against its opponent; and, except in one solitary instance, nearly with equal justice. I say, one instance excepted; for beyond all doubt, on the broad ground of Scripture, in the separation of protestants from the Roman church, all the guilt of schism rested with that corrupt body, which excluded from its communion all those, who would not worship creatures, or conform to anti-christian observances; and, in many ways, made it the duty, the absolute duty, of all the true worshippers of God through Christ Jesus, to come forth and be separate. But perhaps this is the only exception.

I would by no means exclude schism from the vocabulary of sins, of great and grievous sins, as many seem disposed to do. Pride, ambition, obstinacy, and self-will, and other very corrupt passions, powerfully influence both those, who by spiritual tyranny, would lord it over other men's consciences, and impose things not *scriptural*, if not directly *anti-scriptural*, as terms of communion, or even of exemption from pains and penalties; and also on those, who on slight grounds refuse compliance, where the requirement is not evidently wrong; and then magnify by a perverse ingenuity, into a most grievous evil, some harmless posture, or garb, or ceremony. If the one party would, humbly and meekly without desiring to arrogate a power not belonging to man, desist from peremptorily requiring, such things as are doubtful, and liable to be misunderstood, and so scrupled by upright, peaceable, and conscientious persons: and if the other party would determine to comply, as far as on much previous examination of the scripture, with prayer and teachableness, they conscientiously could do it; the schism might be prevented, and all the very bad effects of the church of Christ being thus rent and split into parties

prevented. For these several parties, are generally more eager in disputing with each other, than "contending for "the faith once delivered to the saints;" in making proselytes, than in seeking the conversion of sinners; and in rendering their opponents odious and ridiculous, than in exhibiting our holy religion as lovely and attractive to all around them. In these things, their zeal spends itself to no good purpose.

As to the existing divisions, it appears to me, on long and patient investigation, that they originated from very great criminality on both sides; nor am I prepared to say, on which side it was the greater; and that there is criminality on both sides, in the continuance of them, and still more in the increase of them; in which the heaviest lies, on those who hastily, and on very doubtful or inadequate grounds, make new separations. Yet as to the general division of the Christians in England, into churchmen and dissenters, it appears to me, that in present circumstances, neither individuals, nor publick bodies, can do any thing to terminate it; nor till some unforeseen event make way for a termination, by means, and in a manner, of which little conception can previously be formed. In the mean while, it seems very desirable to abate acrimony and severity, and to differ, where we must differ, in a loving spirit; and to unite with each other in every good work, as far as we can conscientiously. It is in my view in this case, precisely the same, as it was with the Synod of Dort and the Remonstrants; each party throws the whole blame on the other; but impartiality would, I think, nearly allot half to the one and half to the other. True Christians of every description, live, surrounded with ungodly men, nay, such as are profane, and immoral, and contentious, yet they generally are enabled to live peaceably with them all. How is it then, that they cannot, on the same principles, bear with each other, when differences in merely the circumstances of religion are the

only ground of disputations, bickerings, and contests? "Whence come fightings among them?"

2. A large proportion of that, which at present would be disapproved, if not reprobated, in the concluding decision of the Synod of Dort, and in its effects, must be considered, by every impartial and well informed person, as pertaining to that age, and those which had preceded it. The authority of such conventions to determine points of theology, to enforce their decisions by ecclesiastical censures, interdicts, and mandates, such as this conclusion contains, had not been called in question, at least in any great degree, by any of the reformers or reformed churches. It was the general opinion, that princes and states ought to convene councils or assemblies, when needed; and, as far as hope was given of such councils being convened, they generally acted on this principle. They considered the ruling powers as invested with the right of authorising these conventions, to cite before them the persons, whose tenets and conduct gave occasion of convening them; and of animadverting on them as contumacious, if they refused to appear, or to submit to the decisions of the majority. And they regarded it as a great advantage, when the secular power would concur in carrying into effect, their censures, exclusions, or requirements. These points had been almost unanimously assumed as indisputable, from the dawn of the reformation, to the time of this Synod, both on the continent, and in Britain; and little had been advanced, in direct opposition to the justice of proceeding still further to punish the refractory with pains and penalties. The vanquished party indeed generally complained, and remonstrated with sufficient acrimony, yet, when the tables were turned, and they acquired a victory, they used their superiority in the same manner, and sometimes even with still greater severity. How far all this was criminal, unscriptural, unreasonable, or not, is by no

means the present question; but how far the Synod of Dort went beyond the precedents of former times, and of other countries.

3. Thus far, as it seems to me at least, the case is clear, and to an impartial mind not difficult: but how far the whole of this procedure, either in this Synod or in other similar cases, on the continent and in our land, was wrong, *in toto* or *in parte:* whether the whole must be reprobated together, or only some part of it; or where the line should be drawn, are questions of greater difficulty, on which men in general will decide, according to the prevailing sentiments of the day, and those of that part of the visible church to which they belong. Yet, I would venture, with a kind of trepidation, and with much diffidence, to drop a few hints on the subject: the result of very much reflection, during a long course of years, with what other aid I could procure, in addition to the grand standard of truth and duty, of principle and practice, to men of all ranks, individually, or in corporate bodies, the "Oracles of God."

It must, as it appears to me, be incontrovertible, that penal means, of whatever kind, are wholly inadmissible, in matters purely religious; and in which the persons concerned would act peaceably, if not irritated by opposition and persecution; for "oppression in this case often maketh a wise man mad;" and his mad conduct is ascribed to his religious peculiarities, when it originates from other causes, and is excited by oppression. Punishments can have no tendency to enlighten the understanding, inform the mind, or regulate the judgment; and they infallibly increase prejudice, and tempt to resentment. They may indeed make hypocrites, but not believers; formalists, but not spiritual worshippers; and, in a word, they are no 'means of grace' of God's appointment, and on which his blessing may be expected and supplicated. "The weapons of this warfare are carnal, not

"mighty through God." The judicial law of Moses, as a part of the theocracy, punished with death nothing but idolatry and blasphemy, and this to prevent the contagion, "that men might hear, and fear, and do no more such wick-"edness;" not to produce conviction or conformity: and no penalty in other things was appointed, where the publick peace was not interrupted, and God's appointed rulers opposed. In the New Testament, not a word occurs on the subject; except as our Lord blamed the apostles when they forbad one to cast out devils because he followed not with them.

Whatever company, in any nation, can give proper security that they will act as peaceful citizens and good subjects, has, I apprehend, a right to the protection of the state, whatever its religious opinions or observances may be; provided nothing grossly immoral, and contrary to the general laws of the country, be practised under the pretence of religion. Yet the murders, human sacrifices, and other abominations in the East Indies, and in many other places, can have no right to toleration, nor can the toleration be by any means excused. Again, whatever may be urged in favour of allowing papists full liberty, as to their superstitious and idolatrous worship, (for so it doubtless is,) this should be done in their case with peculiar circumspection. But to grant them what they claim, and many claim for them, as *emancipation*, and which means nothing else, than *admission to power and authority;* seems irreconcilable to wisdom either human or divine. It is an essential principle of popery, however disguised by some, and lost sight of by others, *to tolerate none who are not of that church:* and the grant of power to them till this principle be disavowed by bishops, vicars-general, legates, cardinals, and popes, as well as others, in the most full and unequivocal language, is to liberate lions, because they have been harmless when not at liberty: and the event,

should this *emancipation* be fully conceded, will be, that the power thus obtained, will be used in persecution, of those who gave it, as soon as it has acquired a proper measure of consolidation. If the advocates for this measure in our land, should they prove successful, do not themselves live to feel this, their posterity, I can have no doubt, will know it by deplorable experience. Avowed atheists seem also inadmissible to full toleration; as incapable of being bound by any obligation of an oath, or of an affirmation, as in the sight of God, which is equivalent to an oath. How far some kinds of blasphemers should be also exempted, may be a question; but every species of profaneness, or impiety, is not direct blasphemy. Yet if men outrage, or expose to ridicule or odium, the most sacred services of the religion of the country, or if publick instructors inculcate immoral principles; they may, as far as I can see, be restrained, so that the mischief may be prevented; though perhaps without further punishment, except for actual violation of the peace. Every collective body, however, has an indisputable right to prescribe the terms, on which men shall be admitted into it, either as members of the company, or in an official capacity; and if it have funds at its disposal, the terms on which men shall be allowed to receive a share of them: provided that they who join them, do it *voluntarily*, and that others may, without molestation, be permitted to decline these terms, or to withdraw, if they, after having joined them, can no longer conscientiously comply. I say, a *right* indisputable by man, yet a *right*, for the use of which they are responsible to God; and the abuse of which has been and is the source of most deplorable consequences.

If, however, the Synod of Dort had only proceeded to exclude from *office*, publick teachers, whether of congregations or schools, belonging to the church or churches es-

tablished in Belgium, who would not comply with the terms agreed on in the Synod; the *terms* alone would have been the proper subject of our judgment, and not this *exclusion*, provided no further punishment had been inflicted. But this exclusion (*ex officio*) would of course be also (*ex beneficio*) or from the emolument of the office. And how far this would have been justifiable, I am not prepared to say: and, indeed, much depended on the nature of their funds, and the tenure on which they were obtained or held. But one thing is clear, that if some reasonable proportion of the emolument had been reserved to those who were excluded from office, so long as they conducted themselves peaceably, it would have been a very conciliatory measure, and suited to give a convincing testimony, that the glory of God, the peace of the church, the cause of truth, and the salvation of souls had been their motives and object; and not secular and party interests.

In respect of those revenues which, having been appropriated to religious purposes in former ages, fell into the hands of those, who conducted the reformation and formed establishments, it cannot reasonably be expected, that the bodies thus in possession, should voluntarily agree to share them with dissentients: but in revenues raised by taxes, on the present generation for the purposes of supporting religion, and other things connected with it; equity seems to require that a proportion should be awarded to peaceful dissentients, of whatever description, according to the sum which that whole body may be required to pay towards such a tax: for they who contribute, and are good subjects, and can give a pledge to the government of good behaviour, ought, in all reason, to share the benefit in proportion.*

* It may be worthy of consideration, how far a grant from Parliament, for building churches or chapels exclusively for the establishment; while the publick at large must advance the money from the general tax, or taxes, is thus consistent with strict equity. The design is excellent and

When the teachers of congregations and of schools, supported by the revenues of the churches in Belgium, had been excluded or suspended from their office, and its emolument, all that was done in accession, seems to have been unjustifiable. The excluded party, in reason, and according to the scripture, (though not according to the general sentiments of that age,) were entitled to full toleration, to worship God, and instruct others either as preachers or teachers of schools, not supported by the establishment, provided they did this peaceably. At most, only very general restrictions should have been required. But such teachers of separate congregations, and of schools, were not then known, or at least not recognized: nearly all places of worship and schools, were in the hands of the established authorities, and every thing attempted must be done secretly, and then, on that very ground, condemned as a *conventicle* or seditious meeting.

Excommunication, according to scripture, is nothing more than simple exclusion from the communion of the church, "Let him be as an heathen man, and a publican:" except when God *miraculously* by his apostles, who could, in that respect "do nothing against the truth, but "for the truth," inflicted salutary chastisements, "for the "destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved in "the day of the Lord Jesus;" or that "others might learn "not to blaspheme." But when, in addition to such an exclusion, many heavy consequences followed, even to fines, banishment, imprisonment, exclusion from the common benefits of society, and even death, the very word *excommunication* became dreadful and hateful; and the relaxation of all discipline, nay, almost its annihilation, has been the

most desirable; but whether it would not be more unexceptionable, if a proportionable sum were granted to peaceable dissenters, for the building or repairing their places of worship, may be matter of enquiry to impartial legislators.

consequence. Restore the matter to its original use; let the communicants become such of their own *voluntary* choice, admitted on a simple and credible profession of those *things* in which Christianity consists; and let them, if they act inconsistently, be excluded from communion, and left, in their former state, till they give proof of repentance: considered as equally entitled to good will and good offices in temporal things, as our other neighbours; admitted to any means of grace, which may aid their recovery; conversed with in every way, which does not sanction their misconduct; and "restored," if it may be, in "the spirit of meekness." On this plan, I apprehend discipline might again be established, and great benefit arise from it. But they, who cannot inflict miraculous judgments, surely are not authorised to attempt other punishment of excommunicated persons, which have a thousand times oftener been exercised against the truth, than for the truth.

The distinctions, among the different offenders, and the mandates given to the different subordinate classes, and presbyteries, appear in no other way exceptionable, than as the presbyterian plan will of course be objected to, both by episcopalians and independents. But the Synod, as it has been seen, attempted far too much; and, forgetful of our Lord's prohibition, were so eager to root up the tares, that they greatly endangered the wheat also.

THE APPROBATION OF THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND VERY POWERFUL LORDS THE STATES GENERAL.

The States General of Federated Belgium, to all, who shall see and read this, health (or salvation, *salutem*). We make it known (that) when, in order to take away those lamentable and pernicious controversies, which a few years

since, with great detriment to the republick, and disturbance of the peace of the churches, arose concerning the known five heads of Christian doctrine, and those things which depend on them; it seemed proper to us, according to the order in the church of God, and thus also in the Belgick church, to convene at Dordrecht a national Synod of all federated Belgium; and that this might be celebrated (*celebrari*) with the greatest fruit and advantage of the republick, not without much inconvenience (*molestia*) and great expences, we sought for and obtained, unto the same, very many, the most excellent, learned, and celebrated foreign theologians of the reformed church; as it may be seen from the subscription of the decrees of the aforesaid Synod, after each of the heads of doctrine. Moreover, our delegates, being also commissioned (*deputatis*) from each of the provinces, who from the beginning to the end being present, should take care, that all things might there be handled in the fear of God, and in right order, from the word of God alone, in agreement to our sincere intention. And when this aforesaid Synod, by the singular blessing of God, hath now judged with so great a consent of all and every one, as well of foreigners, as of Belgians, concerning the aforementioned five heads of doctrine, and the teachers of them: and we, having been consulted and consenting, published, on the sixth of May last past, the decrees and determination affixed to these presents; we, that the much wished for fruits from this great and holy work (such a one as the reformed churches have never before this time seen) might be abundant to the churches of these countries; seeing that nothing is to us equally desired and cared for as the glory of the most holy name of God, and the preservation and propagation of the true reformed Christian religion, (which is the foundation of prosperity and bond of union of *federated Belgium*,) as the concord, the tranquillity, and the peace

of the churches, and in like manner the preservation of the concord and communion of the churches in these regions with all foreign reformed churches, from which we never ought, nor are able to separate ourselves; having seen, and known, and maturely examined and weighed the aforementioned judgment and decision of the Synod, we have fully in all things approved them, confirmed and ratified them, and by these presents we do approve and ratify them; willing and enacting, (*statuentes*), that no other doctrine concerning the aforesaid five heads of doctrine be taught or propagated in the churches of these regions, besides that which is conformable and agreeable to the aforesaid judgment: enjoining and commanding with authority, to all the ecclesiastical assemblies, the ministers of the churches, the professors and doctors of sacred theology, the rulers of colleges, and to all in general, and to every one without exception, (*in universum*), whom these things can in any way concern or reach unto, that, in the exercise of their ministerial offices and functions, they should in all things follow them faithfully, and sincerely conduct themselves consistently with them. And that this our good intention may every where be fully and in all things satisfied, (or complied with,) we charge and command the orders, governors, the deputies of the orders, the counsellors, and deputed orders of the provinces of Gueldria, and the county of Lutphan, of Holland, West Friezland, Zeland, Utrecht, Frisia, Transisulania, and of the state of Groningen, and the Omlandias, and all their officiaries, judges, and justiciaries, that they should promote and defend the observation of the aforesaid Synodical judgment, and of those things which depend on it; so that they should not either themselves make any change in these things, or permit it by any means to be done by others; Because we judge, that it ought to be so done, to promote the glory of God, the security and safety of the state of

these regions, and the tranquillity and peace of the church. Given (*actum*) under our seal, and it hath been sealed by the sealing of the president, and the subscription of our secretary, the count of Hague, the second of July, in the year 1619.

A. PLOOS.

As also beneath,

By the mandate of the aforesaid High Mightinesses the States General.

Subscribed. C. AERSSEN.

And in that space, the aforesaid seal was impressed on red wax.

On this document it must be again observed, that the measure adopted by the rulers of Belgium, in respect of the decisions of the Synod of Dort, ought not to be judged according to the generally prevailing sentiments of modern times. An immense revolution in opinion, on these subjects, has taken place, within the last two centuries: and to render these rulers and this Synod, amenable to what we may call *statutes long after enacted*, as if whatever there was wrong in the conduct, was *exclusively* their fault, would be palpably unjust. "Are ye not partial in yourselves, and are "become judges of evil thoughts." Jam. ii. 4. "But the "wisdom from above is without *partiality*." Jam. iii. 18. The general *principle* of inducing, by coercive measures, conformity in doctrine and worship, to the decisions of either councils, convocations, synods, or parliaments, was almost universally admitted and acted upon to a later period, than that of this Synod; and though not long afterwards it was questioned, and in some instances relinquished; yet it retained a very general prevalency, for at least half a century

after; nor is it without its advocates, even in the reformed churches, at this present day. Had the opponents of the Synod possessed the same authority, they would have acted in like manner, and so would the rulers of the other countries in Europe. The *exclusive* charge therefore against the measures under consideration, must be laid in those things, which were *peculiar* in their proceedings.

As authority and compulsion can never produce conviction, or any regulation of the mind and judgment; the word *sincerely*, in this state-paper, is very improperly used. It could not indeed reasonably be expected, that even external conformity to so exact and extensive a doctrinal standard, could be generally or durably accomplished: but to suppose that any thing beyond this would be the result, except what argument and explanation, and appeals to the scriptures, in the articles of the Synod itself could effect, was evidently most irrational; yet it was the notion of the times, and does not still appear absurd to all men, even in protestant countries.

Had the rulers of Belgium adopted and ratified the decisions of the Synod, as approving and recommending them to all the persons concerned; and giving countenance in some measure to those who voluntarily avowed the purpose of adhering to them, and leaving others, entirely at liberty, to decline these terms, whether as authorized teachers of congregations or of schools, but no further molesting them, or interfering with their pursuits or instructions; their conduct might have been advocated, especially, if, as it was said before, some fair portion of their former incomes had been reserved to those, who relinquished their situations, rather than promise to conform, but who otherwise behaved as peaceful members of the community. But by absolute authority to demand of all entire conformity, whether voluntary or involuntary; and to follow up this demand by

the secular arm, and by heavy punishments, was altogether unjustifiable. Yet, except the strictness of the rule itself, what country almost was there in Europe at that time, or which almost of either the rulers or teachers of the reformed churches, that did not in great measure attempt to do the same? So that while authority, in many instances repeatedly shifted sides, which ever part was uppermost, its religious decisions were enforced by similar measures.

'The reformers dissented from almost every principle 'of the church of Rome, but this, the right of persecution; 'and though Luther and some others thought it rather too 'much to *burn* heretics, all agreed that they should be re-'strained and punished, and in short, that it was better to 'burn them than to tolerate them. The church of England 'has burnt protestants for heresy, and papists for treason. 'The church of Scotland, and the London ministers in the 'interregnum declared their utter detestation and abhorrence 'of the evil of *toleration*, patronizing and promoting all 'other errors, heresies, and blasphemies whatever, under the abused name of liberty of conscience.' (*Williams on Religious Liberty, Eclectic Review.*)

The main point in this quotation is indisputable; but in respect of Luther especially, it is erroneous. It would, probably be difficult, to produce an instance, in which this great man even so much as sanctioned the punishment of the wild enthusiasts and deceivers of his day, except where the peace of society rendered the interposition of the magistrate indispensable.—'At the same time, he (Luther) took 'occasion to reprobate the cruel sufferings inflicted on the 'poor wretches by the persecutions of the ecclesiastical rulers; 'insisting with the utmost precision on that grand distinction 'of which this reformer never lost sight; that errors in ar-'ticles of faith were not to be suppressed by fire and sword, 'but confuted by the word of God; and that recourse was

'never to be had to capital penalties, except in cases of 'actual sedition and tumult.'—(Milner's Eccl. Hist. vol. iv. p. 1098.

'His worthy friend Linens, probably in a state of irri-'tation, had asked him, Whether he conceived a magistrate 'to be justified in putting to death teachers of false religion? 'A question, then little understood, and not generally agreed 'upon till long afterwards. I am backward, replied *Luther*, 'to pass a sentence of death, let the demerit be ever so ap-'parent; For I am alarmed, when I reflect on the conduct 'of the papists, who have so often abused the statutes of 'capital punishments, against heresy, to the effusion of in-'nocent blood. Among the protestants, in process of time 'I foresee a great probability of a similar abuse, if they 'should now arm the magistrate with the same powers, and 'there should be left on record a single instance, of a person 'having suffered legally for the propagation of false doctrine. 'On this ground, I am decidedly against capital punishment 'in such cases; and think it *quite sufficient* that mischievous 'teachers of religion be removed from their situations.' Milner's Eccl. Hist. vol. v. p. 1100.

But, whatever were the opinions or practice of those times in this respect, or whatever the sentiments of any in our times may be, it seems to me incontrovertible, that every church, or associated company of Christians, whether as a national establishment, or in any other form, has a right (for the use of which they are responsible to God alone) to appoint the terms, on which such as *voluntarily* desire it, shall be admitted to communion with them, or to teach as pastors, and as tutors in their schools and academies; to refuse admission to such as do not agree to these terms, and to exclude those who afterwards act contrary to them. And if they have funds, which are properly *their own*, they have a right to employ these funds, to the exclusive support

of such as voluntarily concur with them; *volenti non sit injuria:* and it is absurd to deem those *compelled*, or their liberty infringed, who *of their own voluntary will* choose to conform, whether under an establishment or elsewhere. The Eclectic Review on 'Gisborne on the Colossians,' says, 'Was it possible for the author of these discourses to put 'down a sentiment so just, and so weighty as this, without 'the perception of its censure bearing against the rites and 'ceremonies of his own church? Is there nothing of will-'worship in that communion? What are sponsors, and the 'sign of the cross in baptism, the *compulsion* to kneel at 'the Lord's supper, but new commands and prohibitions 'added to those which are established in the Bible?—Eclectic Review, May 1817, p. 481.

My concern at present, is only with the word *compulsion.* Can it be conceived, that they who voluntarily come to the Lord's supper in the church of England, consider *kneeling as compulsion?* And, who is at present *compelled* to receive the Lord's supper in that church? Some indeed, are *tempted*, too strongly tempted; but none are *compelled.* Again, would it not excite at least as much surprise and perplexity in a dissenting congregation, both to minister and communicants, if one or more of the company should kneel down to receive the bread and wine, and refuse to receive them in any other posture; as it would in a church, if one or more should sit down, or stand, or refuse to kneel, at the time of receiving? Should the custom of receiving in a sitting posture, be considered as *compulsion*, and as a command, or prohibition added to those which are established in the Bible? By no means. Each company has its usage, whether established by law, or by the appointment of an independent church. That usage is known; it is seldom seen, that a communicant expresses the least objection to it. He is *voluntary*, or he need not come. Whether kneeling, as

uniting solemn prayer with receiving; or sitting, as among Presbyterians and Independents; or standing, or reclining on couches, (the posture no doubt of the apostles, at its institution,) if it be *voluntary* in each person, there is no infringement of *liberty*, whatever else may be controverted respecting the posture.

But to return to Belgium and the Synod of Dort. There toleration of dissentients was not thought of; and the effort was made, to enforce conformity on the whole mass of the population, especially on publick teachers; and this, not only by exclusions, but by very severe disqualifications and other punishments. And probably the change of sentiment and practice in Belgium in this particular, which soon afterwards took place, and the toleration granted there, before it had any legal ground in Britain, combined in augmenting the general odium against the measures connected with this Synod.

However I do, in my private judgment, consider the articles of the Synod of Dort as very *scriptural*: yet, when made the terms of conformity, or of officiating as publick teachers, even with full toleration and exemption from any thing beyond simple exclusion, I must regard them as peculiarly *improper*. The terms of communion, even where none are molested who decline them; and of being publick teachers, should by no means be carried into all the *minutiæ* of doctrine, which perhaps the ablest theologians are convinced to be scriptural. They should include only the grand principles, in which all the humble disciples and pious ministers of Christ agree; and not those in which they are left to differ. "Him that is weak in the faith, receive "ye, but not to doubtful disputations."

The apostles never attempted to enforce by authority, the whole of what they *infallibly knew* to be true. And who then should attempt to enforce their *fallible* opinions on

others? Besides, by aiming at too much, the very end is defeated: the numbers, who from ignorance or indolence, and corrupt motives conform in such cases; and of those, who teach other doctrines, than what they have consented to; becomes too great for any discipline to be exercised over them. Many also, of the most pious and laborious teachers who, in one way or other, manage to explain the established articles in their own favour, or at least as not against them, add greatly to the difficulty and evil: and so all discipline is neglected, as facts deplorably prove.

Probably, this has been, and is in a measure the case, in most or all of the churches; but the proceedings of the Synod of Dort, and the rulers of Belgium at that season, were more exceptionable than those of any other, at least as far as I can judge. And this appears to me the chief blame to which they are justly exposed; but which is almost, if not wholly overlooked, in the torrent of indiscriminate invective in which they, and these transactions, have been long overwhelmed.

THE END.

Lately published by the Author,

REMARKS on the REFUTATION OF CALVINISM, by GEORGE TOMLINE, D. D. F. R. S. Lord Bishop of Lincoln, and Dean of St. Paul's, London. The SECOND EDITION, carefully revised; with many Additions and Retrenchments. 1 vol. 8vo. 14*s*.

MACINTOSH, Printer, London Society's Office, Spitalfields

SERMONS

ON

DIFFERENT SUBJECTS,

LEFT FOR PUBLICATION

BY

JOHN TAYLOR, LL.D.

LATE PREBENDARY OF WESTMINSTER,
RECTOR OF BOSWORTH, LEICESTERSHIRE,
AND MINISTER OF ST. MARGARET'S, WESTMINSTER.

PUBLISHED BY

THE REV. SAMUEL HAYES, A. M.
USHER OF WESTMINSTER-SCHOOL.

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A SERMON,

WRITTEN BY

SAMUEL JOHNSON, LL.D.

FOR THE FUNERAL OF HIS WIFE.

WALPOLE, N. H.
PRINTED FOR THOMAS AND THOMAS, BY C. W. NICHOLS.
1806.

CONTENTS.

SERMON I.

THE 2D CHAPTER OF GENESIS, AND THE FORMER PART OF THE 24TH VERSE.

Therefore shall a man leave his Father and his Mother, and shall cleave unto his Wife. Page 9

SERMON II.

ISAIAH, CHAP. lv. VER. 7.

Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon. Page 21

SERMON III.

PROVERBS, CHAP. xxviii. VER. 14.

Happy is the man that feareth alway; but he that hardeneth his heart, shall fall into mischief. Page 31

SERMON IV.

ISAIAH, CHAP. lviii. VER. 7, 8.

Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out, to thy house? when thou seest the naked that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?

Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily; and thy righteousness shall go before thee, the glory of the Lord shall be thy rereward. Page 40

SERMON V.

NEHEMIAH, CHAP. ix. VER. 33.

Howbeit thou art just in all that is brought upon us, for thou hast done right, but we have done wickedly. Page 52

SERMON VI.

PROVERBS, CHAP. xii. VER. 2.

When Pride cometh, then cometh Shame; but with the Lowly is Wisdom. Page 64

SERMON VII.

JEREMIAH, CHAP. vi. VER. 16.

Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, we will not walk therein. Page 73

SERMON VIII.

ROMANS xii. THE LATTER PART OF THE 16TH VERSE.

Be not wise in your own conceits. Page 83

SERMON IX.

1 CORINTHIANS, CHAP. 11. VER. 28.

But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. Page 94.

SERMON X.

GALATIANS, CHAP. vi. VER. 7.

Be not deceived, God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap. Page 102

SERMON XI.

1 PETER, CHAP. iii. VER. 8.

Finally be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another, love as brethren, be faithful, be courteous. P. 112

SERMON XII.

ECCLESIASTES, CHAP. i. VER. 14.

I have seen all the works that are done under the Sun; and, behold, all is vanity and vexation of spirit. Page 121

SERMON XIII.

2 TIMOTHY, CHAP. iii. PART OF THE 5TH VERSE.

Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof. Page 131

SERMON XIV.

ISAIAH, xxvi. 3.

Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee, because he trusteth in thee. Page 142

SERMON XV.

JOB, xiv. 1.

Man that is born of a Woman, is of few days and full of trouble. Page 151

SERMON XVI.

JOB, i. 22.

In all this Job sinned not, nor charged God foolishly. P. 161

SERMON XVII.

EXODUS, xx. 16.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour. P. 170

SERMON XVIII.

1 CORINTHIANS, vi. 8.

Nay, you do wrong and defraud, and that your brethren. P. 180

SERMON XIX.

2 CORINTHIANS, ix. 7.

Every man according as he purposeth in his heart so let him give, not grudgingly, or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver. Page 189

SERMON XX.

2 PETER, iii. 3.

Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days Scoffers, walking after their own lusts. Page 200

SERMON XXI.

PSALM cxlv. 9.

The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works. Page 211

SERMON XXII.

1 CORINTHIANS, xi. 29.

He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself. Page 220

SERMON XXIII.

JAMES, iii. 16.

Where envying and strife is, there is confusion. Page 228

SERMON XXIV.

PROVERBS xxix. 2.

When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice. P. 238

SERMON XXV.

[*Written by Dr. Johnson, for the Funeral of his Wife.*]

JOHN, xi. 25, 26, (FORMER PART.)

Jesus said unto her, I am the Resurrection, and the Life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth, and believeth in me, shall never die. Page 248

SERMONS, &c.

SERMON I.

The Second Chapter of Geneſis, and the former part of the 24th Verſe.

Therefore ſhall a Man leave his Father and his Mother, and ſhall cleave unto his Wife.

THAT ſociety is neceſſary to the happineſs of human nature, that the gloom of ſolitude, and the ſtillneſs of retirement, however they may flatter at a diſtance with pleaſing views of independence and ſerenity, neither extinguiſh the paſſions, nor enlighten the underſtanding, that diſcontent will intrude upon privacy, and temptations follow us to the deſert, every one may be eaſily convinced, either by his own experience, or that of others. That knowledge is advanced by an intercourſe of ſentiments, and an exchange of obſervations, and that the boſom is diſburthened, by a communication of its cares, is too well known for proof or illuſtration. In ſolitude perplexity ſwells into diſtraction, and grief ſettles into melancholy; even the ſatisfactions and pleaſures, that may by chance be found, are but imperfectly enjoyed, when they are enjoyed without participation.

How high this diſpoſition may extend, and how far ſociety may contribute to the felicity of more exalted natures, it is not eaſy to determine, nor neceſſary to enquire: it ſeems, however, probable, that this inclination is allotted to all ra-

tional beings of limited excellence, and that it is the privilege only of the infinite Creator to derive all his happinefs from himfelf.

It is a proof of the regard of God for the happinefs of mankind, that the means by which it muft be attained are obvious and evident; that we are not left to difcover them, by difficult fpeculations, intricate difquifitions, or long experience, but are led to them, equally by our paffions and our reafon, in profperity and diftrefs. Every man perceives his own infufficiency to fupply himfelf with what either neceffity or convenience require, and applies to others for affiftance. Every one feels his fatisfaction impaired by the fuppreffion of pleafing emotions, and confequently endeavours to find an opportunity of diffufing his fatisfaction.

As a general relation to the reft of the fpecies is not fufficient to procure gratification for the private defires of particular perfons; as clofer ties of union are neceffary to promote the feparate intereftS of individuals; the great Society of the World is divided into different communities, which are again fubdivided into fmaller bodies, and more contracted affociations, which purfue, or ought to purfue, a particular intereft, in fubordination to the public good, and confiftently with the general happinefs of mankind.

Each of thefe fubdivifions produces new dependencies and relations, and every particular relation gives rife to a particular fcheme of duties; duties which are of the utmoft importance, and of the moft facred obligation, as the neglect of them would defeat all the bleffings of fociety, and cut off even the hope of happinefs; as it would poifon the fountain from whence it muft be drawn, and make thofe inftitutions, which have been formed as neceffary to peace and fatisfaction, the means of difquiet and mifery.

The loweft fubdivifion of fociety is that by which it is broken into private families; nor do any duties demand more to be explained and enforced, than thofe which this relation produces; becaufe none are more univerfally obligatory, and perhaps very few more frequently neglected.

The univerſality of theſe duties requires no other proof than may be received from the moſt curſory and ſuperficial obſervation of human life. Very few men have it in their power to injure ſociety in a large extent; the general happineſs of the world can be very little interrupted by the wickedneſs of any ſingle man, and the number is not large of thoſe by whom the peace of any particular nation can be diſturbed; but every man may injure a family, and produce domeſtic diſorders and diſtreſſes; almoſt every one has opportunities, and perhaps ſometimes temptations, to rebel as a wife, or tyrannize as a huſband; and, therefore, to almoſt every one are thoſe admonitions neceſſary, that may aſſiſt in regulating the conduct, and impreſs juſt notions of the behaviour which theſe relations exact.

Nor are theſe obligations more evident than the neglect of them; a neglect of which daily examples may be found, and from which daily calamities ariſe. Almoſt all the miſeries of life, almoſt all the wickedneſs that infeſts, and all the diſtreſſes that afflict mankind, are the conſequences of ſome defect in theſe duties. It is therefore no objection to the propriety of diſcourſing upon them, that they are well known and generally acknowledged; for a very ſmall part of the diſorders of the world proceed from ignorance of the laws, by which life ought to be regulated; nor do many, even of thoſe whoſe hands are polluted with the fouleſt crimes, deny the reaſonableneſs of virtue, or attempt to juſtify their own actions. Men are not blindly betrayed into corruption, but abandon themſelves to their paſſions with their eyes open; and loſe the direction of Truth, becauſe they do not attend to her voice, not becauſe they do not hear, or do not underſtand it. It is therefore no leſs uſeful to rouſe the thoughtleſs, than inſtruct the ignorant; to awaken the attention, than enlighten the underſtanding.

There is another reaſon, for which it may be proper to dwell long upon theſe duties, and return frequently to them; that deep impreſſions of them may be formed and renewed, as

often as time or temptation shall begin to erase them. Offences against society in its greater extent are cognizable by human laws. No man can invade the property, or disturb the quiet of his neighbour, without subjecting himself to penalties, and suffering in proportion to the injuries he has offered. But cruelty and pride, oppression and partiality, may tyrannize in private families without controul; Meekness may be trampled upon, and Piety insulted, without any appeal, but to conscience and to Heaven. A thousand methods of torture may be invented, a thousand acts of unkindness, or disregard, may be committed; a thousand innocent gratifications may be denied, and a thousand hardships imposed, without any violation of national laws. Life may be embittered with hourly vexation; and weeks, months, and years, be lingered out in misery, without any legal cause of separation, or possibility of judicial redress. Perhaps no sharper anguish is felt, than that which cannot be complained of; nor any greater cruelties inflicted, than some which no human authority can relieve.

That marriage itself, an institution designed only for the promotion of happiness, and for the relief of the disappointments, anxieties and distresses to which we are subject in our present state, does not always produce the effects for which it was appointed; that it sometimes condenses the gloom, which it was intended to dispel, and encreases the weight, which was expected to be made lighter by it, must, however unwillingly, be yet acknowledged.

It is to be considered to what causes effects, so unexpected and unpleasing, so contrary to the end of the institution, and so unlikely to arise from it, are to be attributed; it is necessary to enquire, whether those that are thus unhappy, are to impute their misery to any other cause than their own folly, and to the neglect of those duties which prudence and religion equally require.

This enquiry may not only be of use in stating and explaining the duties of the marriage state, but may contribute to free it from licentious misrepresentations, and weak objec-

tions; which indeed can have little force upon minds not already adapted to receive impreſſions from them, by habits of debauchery; but which, when they co-operate with lewdneſs, intemperance and vanity; when they are propoſed to an underſtanding naturally weak, and made yet weaker by luxury and ſloth, by an implicit reſignation to reigning follies, and an habitual compliance with every appetite; may at leaſt add ſtrength to prejudices, to ſupport an opinion already favoured, and perhaps hinder conviction, or at leaſt retard it.

It may indeed be aſſerted to the honour of marriage, that it has few adverſaries among men either diſtinguiſhed for their abilities, or eminent for their virtue. Thoſe who have aſſumed the province of attacking it, of overturning the conſtitution of the world, of encountering the authority of the wiſeſt legiſlators, from whom it has received the higheſt ſanction of human wiſdom; and ſubverting the maxims of the moſt flouriſhing States, in which it has been dignified with honours, and promoted with immunities; thoſe who have undertaken the taſk of contending with reaſon and experience, with earth and with heaven, are men who ſeem generally not ſelected by nature for great attempts, or difficult undertakings. They are, for the moſt part, ſuch as owe not their determinations to their arguments, but their arguments to their determinations; diſputants, animated not by a conſciouſneſs of truth, but by the numbers of their adherents; and heated, not with zeal for the right, but with the rage of licentiouſneſs and impatience of reſtraint. And perhaps to the ſober, the underſtanding, and the pious, it may be ſufficient to remark, that Religion and Marriage have the ſame enemies.

There are indeed ſome in other communions of the chriſtian church, who cenſure marriage upon different motives, and prefer celibacy as a ſtate more immediately devoted to the honour of God, and the regular and aſſiduous practice of the duties of religion; and have recommended vows of abſtinence, no where commanded in ſcripture, and impoſed reſtraints upon lawful deſires; of which it is eaſy to judge how

well they are adapted to the prefent ftate of human nature, by the frequent violation of them, even in thofe fociefies where they are voluntarily incurred, and where no vigilance is omitted to fecure the obfervation of them.

But the authors of thefe rigorous and unnatural fchemes of life, though certainly mifled by falfe notions of holinefs, and perverted conceptions of the duties of our religion, have at leaft the merit of miftaken endeavours to promote virtue, and muft be allowed to have reafoned at leaft with fome degree of probability, in vindication of their conduct. They were generally perfons of piety, and fometimes of knowledge, and are therefore not to be confounded with the fool, the drunkard, and the libertine. They who decline marriage for the fake of a more fevere and mortified life, are furely to be diftinguifhed from thofe, who condemn it as too rigorous a confinement, and wifh the abolition of it, in favour of boundlefs voluptuoufnefs and licenfed debauchery.

Perhaps even the errors of miftaken goodnefs may be rectified, and the prejudices furmounted by deliberate attention to the nature of the inftitution; and certainly the calumnies of wickednefs may be, by the fame means, confuted, though its clamours may not be filenced; fince commonly in debates like this, confutation and conviction are very diftant from each other. For that nothing but vice or folly obftructs the happinefs of a married life, may be made evident by examining.

Firft, The Nature and End of Marriage.

Secondly, The means by which that end is to be attained.

Firft, The Nature and End of Marriage.

The Vow of Marriage which the wifdom of moft civilized nations has enjoined, and which the rules of the chriftian church enjoin, may be properly confidered as a vow of perpetual and indiffoluble friendfhip; friendfhip which no change of fortune, nor any alteration of external circumftances can be allowed to interrupt or weaken. After the commencement of this ftate there remain no longer any feparate inter-

ests; the two individuals become united, and are therefore to enjoy the same felicity, and suffer the same misfortunes; to have the same friends and the same enemies, the same success and the same disappointments. It is easy by pursuing the parallel between friendship and marriage, to shew how exact a conformity there is between them, to prove that all the precepts laid down with respect to the contraction, and the maxims advanced with regard to the effects of friendship, are true of marriage in a more literal sense, and a stricter acceptation.

It has been long observed that friendship is to be confined to one; or that, to use the words of the Greek axiom, *He that hath friends, has no friend.* That ardour of kindness, that unbounded confidence, that unsuspecting security which friendship requires, cannot be extended beyond a single object. A divided affection may be termed benevolence, but can hardly rise to friendship; for the narrow limits of the human mind allow it not intensely to contemplate more than one idea. As we love one more, we must love another less; and however impartially we may, for a very short time, distribute our regards, the balance of affection will quickly incline, perhaps against our consent, to one side or the other. Besides, though we should love our friends *equally*, which is perhaps *not* possible; and *each* according to their *merit*, which is *very difficult*: what shall secure them from jealousy of each other? Will not each think highly of his own value, and imagine himself rated below his worth? Or what shall preserve their common friend from the same jealousy, with regard to them? As he divides his affection and esteem between them, he can in return claim no more than a dividend of theirs: and as he regards them equally, they may justly rank some other in equality with him; and what then shall hinder an endless communication of confidence, which must certainly end in treachery at last? Let these reflections be applied to marriage, and perhaps polygamy may lose its vindicators.

It is remarked that **Friendship amongst equals is the most*

* Amicitia inter pares firmissima.

perfluous; for, though often neglected, it never was denied. Every man will, without hesitation, confess that it is absurd to trust a known deceiver, or voluntarily to depend for quiet and for happiness upon insolence, cruelty and oppression. Thus marriage appears to differ from friendship chiefly in the degree of its efficacy, and the authority of its institution. It was appointed by God himself, as necessary to happiness, even in a state of innocence; and the relation produced by it, was declared more powerful than that of birth. *Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife.* But as, notwithstanding its conformity to human nature, it sometimes fails to produce the effects intended, it is necessary to enquire,

Secondly, By what means the end of marriage is to be attained.

As it appears, by examining the natural system of the universe, that the greatest and smallest bodies are invested with the same properties, and moved by the same laws; so a survey of the moral world will inform us, that greater or less societies are to be made happy by the same means, and that, however relations may be varied, or circumstances changed, virtue, and virtue alone, is the parent of felicity. We can only, in whatsoever state we may be placed, secure ourselves from disquiet and from misery by a resolute attention to truth and reason. Without this, it is in vain that a man chooses a friend, or cleaves to a wife. If passion be suffered to prevail over right, and the duties of our state be broken through, or neglected, for the sake of gratifying our anger, our pride, or our revenge; the union of hearts will quickly be dissolved, and kindness will give way to resentment and aversion.

The duties, by the practice of which a married life is to be made happy, are the same with those of friendship, but exalted to higher perfection. Love must be more ardent, and confidence without limits. It is therefore necessary on each part to deserve that confidence by the most unshaken fidelity, and to preserve their love unextinguished by continual acts of ten-

dness; not only to detest all real, but seeming offences; and to avoid suspicion and guilt with almost equal solicitude.

But since the frailty of our nature is such that we cannot hope from each other an unvaried rectitude of conduct, or an uninterrupted course of wisdom or virtue; as folly will sometimes intrude upon an unguarded hour; and temptations, by frequent attacks, will sometimes prevail; one of the chief acts of love is readily to forgive errors, and overlook defects. Neglect is to be reclaimed by kindness, and perverseness softened by compliance. Sudden starts of passion are patiently to be borne, and the calm moments of recollection silently expected. For if one offence be made a plea for another; if anger be to be opposed with anger, and reproach retorted for reproach; either the contest must be continued forever, or one must at last be obliged by violence to do what might have been at first done, not only more gracefully, but with more advantage.

Marriage, however in general it resembles friendship, differs from it in this; that all its duties are not reciprocal. Friends are equal in every respect; but the relation of marriage produces authority on one side, and exacts obedience on the other; obedience, an unpleasing duty; which yet the nature of the state makes indispensible; for friends may separate when they can no longer reconcile the sentiments, or approve the schemes of each other; but as marriage is indissoluble, either one must be content to submit, when *conviction* cannot be obtained, or life must be wasted in perpetual disputes.

But though obedience may be justly required, servility is not to be exacted; and though it may be lawful to exert authority, it must be remembered, that to govern and to tyrannize are very different, and that oppression will naturally provoke rebellion.

The great rule both of authority and obedience is the law of God; a law which is not to be broken for the promotion of any ends, or in compliance with any commands; and which indeed never can be violated without destroying that confi-

dence which is the great source of mutual happiness; for how can that person be trusted, whom no principles oblige to fidelity?

Thus religion appears, in every state of life, to be the basis of happiness, and the operating power which makes every good institution valid and efficacious. And he that shall attempt to attain happiness by the means which God has ordained, and *shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife*, shall surely find the highest degree of satisfaction that our present state allows, if, in his choice, he pays the first regard to virtue, and regulates his conduct by the precepts of religion.

SERMON

SERMON II.

ISAIAH, CHAP. LV. VERSE 7.

Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.

THAT God is a Being of infinite mercy; that he desires not the death of a sinner, nor takes any pleasure in the misery of his creatures, may not only be deduced from the consideration of his nature and his attributes; but, for the sake of those that are incapable of philosophical enquiries, who make far the greatest part of mankind, it is evidently revealed to us in the scriptures, in which the Supreme Being, the source of life, the author of existence, who spake the word, and the world was made, who commanded, and it was created, is described as looking down from the height of infinite felicity, with tenderness and pity, upon the sons of men; inciting them, by soft impulses, to perseverance in virtue, and recalling them, by instruction and punishment, from error and from vice. He is represented as not more formidable for his power, than amiable for his mercy; and is introduced as expostulating with mankind upon their obstinacy in wickedness, and warning them, with the highest affection, to avoid those punishments which the laws of his government make it necessary to inflict upon the inflexible and disobedient. *Return unto me, and I will return unto you, saith the Lord of Hosts*, Mal. iii. 7. *Make you a new heart, and a new spirit, for why will ye die, O house of Israel?* Ezek. xviii. 31. His mercy is ever made the chief motive of obedience to him; and with the highest reason inculcated, as

the attribute which may animate us most powerfully to an attention to our duty. *If thou, O Lord, wert extreme to mark what is done amiss, O Lord, who shall abide it? But there is mercy with thee, therefore shalt thou be feared.* If God were a power unmerciful and severe, a rigid exacter of unvaried regularity and unfailing virtue; if he were not to be pleased but with perfection, nor to be pacified after transgressions and offences; in vain would the best then endeavour to recommend themselves to his favour; in vain would the most circumspect watch the motions of his own heart, and the most diligent apply himself to the exercise of virtue. They would only destroy their ease by ineffectual solicitude, confine their desires with unnecessary restraints, and weary out their lives in unavailing labours. God would not be to be served, because all service would be rejected; it would be much more reasonable to abstract the mind from the contemplation of him, than to have him only before us as an object of terror, as a Being too mighty to be resisted, and too cruel to be implored; a Being that created men only to be miserable, and revealed himself to them only to interrupt even the transient and imperfect enjoyments of this life, to astonish them with terror, and to overwhelm them with despair.

But there is mercy with him, therefore shall he be feared. It is reasonable that we should endeavour to please him, because we know that every sincere endeavour will be rewarded by him; that we should use all the means in our power to enlighten our minds and regulate our lives, because our errors, if involuntary, will not be imputed to us; and our conduct, though not exactly agreeable to the divine idea of rectitude, yet if approved, after honest and diligent enquiries, by our own consciences, will not be condemned by that God, who judges of the heart, weighs every circumstance of our lives, and admits every real extenuation of our failings and transgressions.

Were there not mercy with him, were he not to be reconciled after the commission of a crime, what must be the state

of those, who are conscious of having once offended him? A state of gloomy melancholy, or outrageous desperation; a distaste or weariness of life, and inexpressible agonies at the thought of death; for what affright or affliction could equal the horrors of that mind which expected every moment to fall into the hands of implacable Omnipotence?

But the mercy of God extends not only to those that have made his will, in some degree, the rule of their actions, and have only deviated from it by inadvertency, surprise, inattention, or negligence; but even to those that have polluted themselves with studied and premeditated wickedness; that have violated his commands in opposition to conviction, and gone on, from crime to crime, under a sense of the divine disapprobation.

Even these are not forever excluded from his favour, but have in their hands means, appointed by himself, of reconciliation to him; means by which pardon may be obtained, and by which they may be restored to those hopes of happiness, from which they have fallen by their own fault.

The great duty, to the performance of which these benefits are promised, is repentance; a duty which it is of the utmost importance to every man to understand and practise; and which it therefore may be necessary to explain and enforce, by shewing,

First, What is the true nature of Repentance.

Secondly, What are the obligations to an early Repentance.

First, What is the true nature of Repentance.

The duty of repentance, like most other parts of religion, has been misrepresented by the weakness of superstition, or the artifices of interest. The clearest precepts have been obscured by false interpretations, and one error added to another, till the understanding of men has been bewildered, and their morals depraved by a false appearance of religion.

Repentance has been made, by some, to consist in the outward expressions of sorrow for sin, in tears and sighs, in dejection and lamentation.

It must be owned that where the crime is public, and where others may be in danger of corruption from the example, some public and open declarations of repentance may be proper, if made with decency and propriety, which are necessary to preserve the best actions from contempt and ridicule; but they are necessary only for the sake of destroying the influence of a bad example, and are no otherwise essential to this duty. [No man is obliged to accuse himself of crimes, which are known to God alone; even the fear of hurting others ought often to restrain him from it, since to confess crimes may be, in some measure, to teach them, and those may imitate him in wickedness, who will not follow him in his repentance.]

It seems here not impertinent to mention the practice of private confession to the Priest, indispensibly enjoined by the Roman Church, as absolutely necessary to true repentance; but which is no where commanded in scripture, or recommended otherwise than as a method of disburthening the conscience, for the sake of receiving comfort or instruction, and as such, is directed by our own liturgy.

Thus much, and no more, seems to be implied in the Apostle's precept, *of confessing our faults one to another*, a precept expressed with such latitude, that it appears only to be one of those which it may be often convenient to observe, but which is to be observed no further than as it may be convenient. For we are left entirely at liberty, what terms, whether general or particular, we shall use in our confessions. The precept, in a literal and rational sense, can be said to direct no more, than general acts of humiliation, and acknowledgments of our own depravity.

No man ought to judge of the efficacy of his own repentance, or the sincerity of another's, by such variable and uncertain tokens as proceed more from the constitution of the body than the disposition of the mind, or more from sudden passions and violent emotions, than from a fixed temper or settled resolutions. Tears are often to be found, where there is little sorrow, and the deepest sorrow without any tears.

Even sorrow itself is no other than an accidental, or a secondary part of repentance, which may, and indeed ought to arise from the consciousness of our own guilt; but which is merely a natural and necessary effect, in which choice has very little part, and which therefore is no virtue. He that feels no sorrow for sin, has indeed great reason to doubt of the sincerity of his own repentance, since he seems not to be truly sensible of his danger and his misery; but he that feels it in the highest degree is not to put confidence in it. He is only to expect mercy upon his reformation.

For reformation is the chief part of repentance; not he that only bewails and confesses, but he that forsakes his sins, repents acceptably to God, that God who *will have mercy, and not sacrifice:* who will only accept a pure heart and real virtue, not outward forms of grief, nor pompous solemnities of devotion. To conceive that any thing can be substituted in the place of reformation, is a dangerous and fatal, though perhaps no uncommon error; nor is it less erroneous, though less destructive, to suppose that any thing can be added to the efficacy of a good life by a conformity to any extraordinary ceremonies or particular institutions.

To false notions of repentance many nations owe the custom which prevails amongst them, of retiring in the decline of life to solitudes and cloisters, to atone for wickedness by penance and mortifications. It must indeed be confessed, that it may be prudent in a man, long accustomed to yield to particular temptations, to remove himself from them as far as he can, because every passion is more strong or violent as its particular object is more near. Thus it would be madness in a man, long enslaved by intemperance, to frequent revels and banquets with an intent to reform; nor can it be expected that cruelty and tyranny should be corrected by continuance in high authority.

That particular state, which contributes most to excite and stimulate our inordinate passions, may be changed with very

good effect; but any retirement from the world does not necessarily precede or follow repentance, because it is not requisite to reformation. A man, whose conscience accuses him of having perverted others, seems under some obligations to continue in the world, and to practise virtue in public, that those who have been seduced by his example, may by his example be reclaimed.

For reformation includes not only the forbearance of those crimes of which we have been guilty, and the practice of those duties which we have hitherto neglected, but a reparation, as far as we are able to make it, of all the injuries that we have done, either to mankind in general, or to particular persons. If we have been guilty of the open propagation of error, or the promulgation of falsehood, we must make our recantation no less openly; we must endeavour, without regard to the shame and reproach to which we may be exposed, to undeceive those whom we have formerly misled. If we have deprived any man of his right, we must restore it to him; if we have aspersed his reputation, we must retract our calumny. Whatever can be done to obviate the ill consequences of our past misconduct, must be diligently and steadily practised. Whoever has been made vicious or unhappy by our fault, must be restored to virtue and happiness, so far as our counsel or fortune can contribute to it.

Let no man imagine that he may indulge his malice, his avarice, or his ambition, at the expense of others; that he may raise himself to wealth and honour by the breach of every law of heaven and earth, then retire laden with the plunder of the miserable, spend his life in fantastic penances, or false devotion, and by his compliance with the external duties of religion, atone for withholding what he has torn away from the lawful possessor by rapine and extortion. Let him not flatter himself with false persuasions that prayer and mortification can alter the great and invariable rules of reason and justice. Let him not think that he can acquire a right to keep what he had no right to take away, or that frequent prostrations

before God will justify his perseverance in oppressing men. Let him be assured that his presence profanes the temple, and that his prayer will be turned into sin.

A frequent and serious reflection upon the necessity of reparation and restitution, may be very effectual to restrain men from injustice and defamation, from cruelty and extortion; for nothing is more certain, than that most propose to themselves to die the death of the righteous, and intend, however they may offend God in the pursuit of their interest, or the gratifications of their passions, to reconcile themselves to him by repentance. Would men therefore deeply imprint upon their minds the true notions of repentance in its whole extent, many temptations would lose their force; for who would utter a falsehood which he must shamefully retract; or take away, at the expense of his reputation and his innocence, what, if he hopes for eternal happiness, he must afterwards restore? Who would commit a crime, of which he must retain the guilt, but lose the advantage?

There is indeed a partial restitution, with which many have attempted to quiet their consciences, and have betrayed their own souls. When they are sufficiently enriched by wicked practices, and leave off to rob from satiety of wealth, or are awaked to reflection upon their own lives by danger, adversity, or sickness, they then become desirous to be at peace with God, and hope to obtain, by refunding part of their acquisitions, a permission to enjoy the rest. In pursuance of this view, churches are built, schools endowed, the poor clothed, and the ignorant educated; works indeed highly pleasing to God, when performed in concurrence with the other duties of religion, but which will never atone for the violation of justice. To plunder one man for the sake of relieving another, is not charity; to build temples with the gains of wickedness, is to endeavour to bribe the Divinity. This ought ye to have done, and not left the other undone. Ye ought doubtless to be charitable, but ye ought first to be just.

There are others who consider God as a Judge still more easily reconciled to crimes, and therefore perform their acts of atonement after death, and destine their estates to charity, when they can serve the end of luxury or vanity no longer. But whoever he be that has loaded his soul with the spoils of the unhappy, and riots in affluence by cruelty and injustice, let him not be deceived! God is not mocked. Restitution must be made to those who have been wronged, and whatever he withholds from them, he withholds at the hazard of eternal happiness.

An amendment of life is the chief and essential part of repentance. He that has performed that great work, needs not disturb his conscience with subtile scruples, or nice distinctions. He needs not recollect whether he was awakened from the lethargy of sin, by the love of God, or the fear of punishment. The scripture applies to all our passions; and eternal punishments had been threatened to no purpose, if these menaces were not intended to promote virtue.

But as this reformation is not to be accomplished by our own natural power, unassisted by God, we must, when we form our first resolutions of a new life, apply ourselves, with fervour and constancy, to those means which God has prescribed for obtaining his assistance. We must implore a blessing by frequent prayer, and confirm our faith by the holy sacrament. We must use all those institutions that contribute to the increase of piety, and omit nothing that may either promote our progress in virtue, or prevent a relapse into vice. It may be enquired, whether a repentance begun in sickness, and prevented by death from exerting its influence upon the conduct, will avail in the sight of God. To this question it may be answered in general, that, as all reformation is begun by a change of the temper and inclinations, which, when altered to a certain degree, necessarily produce an alteration in the life and manners; if God who sees the heart, sees it rectified in such a manner as would consequently produce a good life, he will accept that repentance.

But it is of the highest importance to those who have so long delayed to secure their salvation, that they lose none of the moments which yet remain; that they omit no act of justice or mercy now in their power; that they summon all their diligence to improve the remains of life, and exert every virtue which they have opportunities to practise. And when they have done all that can possibly be done by them, they cannot yet be certain of acceptance, because they cannot know whether a repentance, proceeding wholly from the fear of death, would not languish and cease to operate, if that fear was taken away.

Since therefore such is the hazard and uncertain efficacy of repentance long delayed, let us seriously reflect,

Secondly, upon the obligations to an early repentance.

He is esteemed by the prudent and the diligent to be no good regulator of his private affairs, who defers till to-morrow, what is necessary to be done, and what it is in his power to do to-day. The obligation would still be stronger, if we suppose that the present is the only day in which he knows it will be in his power. This is the case of every man, who delays to reform his life, and lulls himself in the supineness of iniquity. He knows not that the opportunities he now rejects will ever be again offered him, or that they will not be denied him because he has rejected them. This he certainly knows, that life is continually stealing from him, and that every day cuts off some part of that time which is already perhaps almost at an end.

But the time not only grows every day shorter, but the work to be performed in it more difficult; every hour, in which repentance is delayed, produces something new to be repented of. Habits grow stronger by long continuance, and passions more violent by indulgence. Vice, by repeated acts, becomes almost natural; and pleasures, by frequent enjoyment, captivate the mind almost beyond resistance.

If avarice has been the predominant passion, and wealth has been accumulated by extortion and rapacity, repentance is not

to be postponed. Acquisitions, long enjoyed, are with great difficulty quitted; with so great difficulty, that we seldom, very seldom, meet with true repentance in those whom the desire of riches has betrayed to wickedness. Men, who could willingly resign the luxuries and sensual pleasures of a large fortune, cannot consent to live without the grandeur and the homage. And they, who would leave all, cannot bear the reproach which they apprehend from such an acknowledgment of wrong.

Thus are men withheld from repentance, and consequently debarred from eternal felicity; but these reasons, being founded in temporal interest, acquire every day greater strength to mislead us, though not greater efficacy to justify us. A man may, by fondly indulging a false notion, voluntarily forget that it is false, but can never make it true. We must banish every false argument, every known delusion from our minds, before our passions can operate in its favour; and forsake what we know must be forsaken, before we have endeared it to ourselves by long possession. Repentance is always difficult, and the difficulty grows still greater by delay. But let those who have hitherto neglected this great duty remember, that it is yet in their power, and that they cannot perish everlastingly but by their own choice! Let them therefore endeavour to redeem the time lost, and repair their negligence by vigilance and ardour. *Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.*

SERMON

SERMON III.

PROVERBS, CHAP. XXVIII. VER. 14.

Happy is the man that feareth alway: but he that hardeneth his heart, shall fall into mischief.

THE great purpose of revealed religion is to afford man a clear representation of his dependence on the Supreme Being, by teaching him to consider God as his Creator and Governor, his Father and his Judge. Those, to whom Providence has granted the knowledge of the holy scriptures, have no need to perplex themselves with difficult speculations, to deduce their duty from remote principles, or to enforce it by doubtful motives. The bible tells us, in plain and authoritative terms, that there is a way to life and a way to death; that there are acts which God will reward, and acts that he will punish; that with sobernes, righteousnes and godlines, God will be pleased; and that with intemperance, iniquity and impiety, God will be offended; and that, of those who are careful to please him, the reward will be such, as eye hath not seen, nor ear heard; and of those who, having offended him, die without repentance, the punishment will be inconceivably severe and dreadful.

In consequence of this general doctrine, the whole system of moral and religious duty is expressed, in the language of scripture, by the *fear of God*. A good man is characterised, as a man that feareth God; and the fear of the Lord is said to be the beginning of wisdom; and the text affirms, that happy is the man that feareth alway.

On the distinction of this fear into servile and filial, or

fear of punishment, or fear of offence, on which much has been superstructed by the casuistical theology of the Romish Church, it is not necessary to dwell. It is sufficient to observe, that the religion which makes fear the great principle of action, implicitly condemns all self-confidence, all presumptuous security; and enjoins a constant state of vigilance and caution, a perpetual distrust of our own hearts, a full conviction of our natural weakness, and an earnest solicitude for divine assistance.

The philosophers of the heathen world seemed to hope, that man might be flattered into virtue, and therefore told him much of his rank, and of the meanness of degeneracy; they asserted, indeed with truth, that all greatness was in the practice of virtue; but of virtue their notions were narrow; and pride, which their doctrine made its chief support, was not of power sufficient to struggle with sense or passion.

Of that religion, which has been taught from God, the basis is humility: a holy fear which attends good men through the whole course of their lives, and keeps them always attentive to the motives and consequences of every action; if always unsatisfied with their progress in holiness, always wishing to advance, and always afraid of falling away.

This fear is of such efficacy to the great purpose of our being, that the Wise Man has pronounced him happy that fears always; and declares that he who hardens his heart shall fall into mischief. Let us therefore carefully consider,

First, What he is to fear, whose fear will make him happy.

Secondly, What is that hardness of heart which ends in mischief.

Thirdly, How the heart is hardened. And,

Fourthly, What is the consequence of hardness of heart.

First, We must enquire, what he is to fear, whose fear will make him happy.

The great and primary object of a good man's fear, is sin; and in proportion to the atrociousness of the crime, he will shrink from it with more horror. When he meditates on the

infinite perfection of his maker and his judge; when he considers that the heavens are not pure in the sight of God, and yet remembers that he must in a short time appear before him; he dreads the contaminations of evil, and endeavours to pass through his appointed time with such cautions as may keep him unspotted from the world.

The dread of sin necessarily produces the dread of temptation: he that wishes to escape the effects, flies likewise from the cause. The humility of a man truly religious seldom suffers him to think himself able to resist those incitements to evil which, by the approach of immediate gratifications, may be presented to sense or fancy; his care is not for victory, but safety; and when he can *escape* assaults, he does not willingly *encounter* them.

The continual occurrence of temptation, and that imbecility of nature which every man sees in others, and has experienced in himself, seems to have made many doubtful of the possibility of salvation. In the common modes of life, they find that business ensnares, and that pleasure seduces; that success produces pride, and miscarriage envy; that conversation consists too often of censure or of flattery; and that even care for the interests of friends, or attention to the establishment of a family, generates contest and competition, enmity and malevolence, and at last fills the mind with secular solicitude.

Under the terrors which this prospect of the world has impressed upon them, many have endeavoured to secure their innocence by excluding the possibility of crimes; and have fled for refuge, from vanity and sin, to the solitude of deserts; where they have passed their time in woods and caverns; and, after a life of labour and maceration, prayer and penitence, died at last in secrecy and silence.

Many more, of both sexes, have withdrawn, and still withdraw themselves from crowds, and glitter, and pleasure, to monasteries and convents; where they engage themselves, by

irrevocable vows, in certain modes of life, more or *less* auſtere, according to the ſeveral inſtitutions; but all of them compriſing many poſitive hardſhips, and all prohibiting almoſt all ſenſual gratifications. The fundamental and general principle of all monaſtic communities is celibacy, poverty, and obedience to the ſuperior. In ſome there is a perpetual abſtinence from all food that may join delight with nouriſhment; to which, in others, is added an obligation to ſilence and ſolitude;—to ſuffer, to watch, and to pray, is their whole employment.

Of theſe, it muſt be confeſſed, that they fear always, and that they eſcape many temptations, to which all are expoſed, and by which many fall, who venture themſelves into the whirl of human affairs; they are exempt from avarice and all its concomitants, and by allowing themſelves to poſſeſs nothing, they are free from thoſe conteſts for honour and power which fill the open world with ſtratagems and violence. But ſurely it cannot be ſaid that they have reached the perfection of a religious life; it cannot be allowed that flight is victory; or that he fills his place in the creation laudably, who does no ill, *only* becauſe he does *nothing*. Thoſe who live upon that which is produced by the labour of others, could not live if there were none to labour; and if celibacy could be univerſal, the race of man muſt ſoon have an end.

Of theſe recluſes it may without uncharitable cenſure be affirmed, that they have ſecured their innocence by the loſs of their virtue; that to avoid the commiſſion of ſome faults, they have made many duties impracticable; and that, leſt they ſhould do what they ought *not* to do, they leave much *undone* which they ought to *do*. They muſt, however, be allowed to expreſs a juſt ſenſe of the dangers with which we are ſurrounded, and a ſtrong conviction of the vigilance neceſſary to obtain ſalvation; and it is our buſineſs to avoid their errors and imitate their piety.

He is happy that carries about with him in the world the temper of the cloiſter; and preſerves the fear of doing evil,

while he suffers himself to be impelled by the zeal of doing good; who uses the comforts and the conveniences of his condition as though he used them not, with that constant desire of a better state which sinks the value of earthly things; who can be rich or poor, without pride in riches, or discontent in poverty; who can manage the business of life with such indifference as may shut out from his heart all incitements to fraud or injustice; who can partake the pleasures of sense with temperance, and enjoy the distinctions of honour with moderation; who can pass undefiled through a polluted world, and, among all the vicissitudes of good and evil, have his heart fixed only where true joys are to be found.

This can only be done by fearing always, by preserving in the mind a constant apprehension of the Divine presence, and a constant dread of the Divine displeasure; impressions which the converse of mankind, and the solicitations of sense and fancy are continually labouring to efface, and which we must therefore renew by all such practices as religion prescribes; and which may be learned from the lives of them who have been distinguished as examples of piety, by the general approbation of the christian world.

The great efficient of union between the soul and its Creator, is prayer; of which the necessity is such that St. Paul directs us to pray without ceasing; that is, to preserve in the mind such a constant dependence upon God, and such a constant desire of his assistance, as may be equivalent to constant prayer.

No man can pray with ardour of devotion, but he must excite in himself a reverential idea of that power to whom he addresses his petitions; nor can he suddenly reconcile himself to an action by which he shall displease him to whom he has been returning thanks for his creation and preservation, and by whom he hopes to be still preserved. He therefore who prays often, fortifies himself by a natural effect, and may hope to be preserved in safety by the stronger aid of Divine protection.

Besides the returns of daily and regular prayer, it will be necessary for most men to assist themselves, from time to time, by some particular and unaccustomed acts of devotion. For this purpose intervals of retirement may be properly recommended; in which the dust of life may be shaken off, and in which the course of life may be properly reviewed, and its future possibilities estimated. At such times secular temptations are removed, and earthly cares are dismissed; a vain, transitory world may be contemplated in its true state; past offences may obtain pardon by repentance; new resolutions may be formed upon new convictions; the past may supply instruction to the present and to the future; and such preparation may be made for those events which threaten spiritual danger, that temptation cannot easily come unexpected; and interest and pleasure, whenever they renew their attacks, will find the soul upon its guard, with either caution to avoid, or vigour to repel them.

In these seasons of retreat and recollection, what external helps shall be added must by every one be discreetly and soberly considered. Fasts and other austerities, however they have been brought into disrepute by wild enthusiasm, have been always recommended and always practised by the sincere believers of revealed religion; and as they have a natural tendency to disengage the mind from sensuality, they may be of great use as awakeners of holy fear; and they may assist our progress in a good life, while they are considered only as expressions of our love of God, and are not substituted for the love of our neighbours.

As all those duties are to be practised, lest the heart should be hardened, we are to consider,

Secondly, What is meant by *hardness of heart*.

It is apparent from the text, that the hardness of heart, which betrays to mischief, is contrary to the fear which secures happiness. The fear of God is a certain tenderness of spirit, which shrinks from evil and the causes of evil; such a sense of God's presence, and such persuasion of his justice, as gives

fin the appearance of evil, and therefore excites every effort to combat and escape it.

Hardness of heart, therefore, is a thoughtless neglect of the Divine law; such an acquiescence in the pleasures of sense, and such delight in the pride of life, as leaves no place in the mind for meditation on higher things; such an indifference about the last event of human actions, as never looks forward to a future state, but suffers the passions to operate with their full force, without any other end than the gratifications of the present world.

To men of hearts thus hardened, Providence is seldom wholly inattentive; they are often called to the remembrance of their Creator, both by blessings and afflictions; by recoveries from sickness, by deliverances from danger, by loss of friends, and by miscarriage of transactions. As these calls are neglected, the hardness is increased; and there is danger lest he, whom they have refused to hear, should call them no more.

This state of dereliction is the highest degree of misery; and, since it is so much to be dreaded, all approaches to it are diligently to be avoided. It is therefore necessary to enquire,

Thirdly, How, or by what causes the heart is hardened.

The most dangerous hardness of heart is that which proceeds from some enormous wickedness, of which the criminal dreads the recollection because he cannot prevail upon himself to repair the injury, or because he dreads the irruption of those images by which guilt must always be accompanied; and, finding a temporal ease in negligence and forgetfulness, by degrees confirms himself in stubborn impenitence.

This is the most dreadful and deplorable state of the heart; but this I hope is not very common. That which frequently occurs, though very dangerous, is not desperate; since it consists, not in the perversion of the will, but in the alienation of the thought; by such hearts God is not defied, he is only forgotten. Of this forgetfulness the general causes are worldly cares and sensual pleasures. If there is a man, of whose soul avarice or ambition have complete possession, and who places

his hope in riches or advancement, he will be employed in bargains or in ſchemes, and make no excurſion into remote futurity, nor conſider the time in which the rich and the poor ſhall lie down together; when all temporal advantages ſhall forſake him, and he ſhall appear before the ſupreme tribunal of eternal juſtice. The ſlave of pleaſure ſoon ſinks into a kind of voluptuous dotage; intoxicated with preſent delights, and careleſs of every thing elſe; his days and his nights glide away in luxury or in vice, and he has no care but to keep thought away; for thought is always troubleſome to him who lives without his own approbation.

That ſuch men are not rouſed to the knowledge and the conſideration of their real ſtate, will appear leſs ſtrange, when it is obſerved, that they are almoſt always either ſtupidly, or profanely negligent of thoſe external duties of religion, which are inſtituted to excite and preſerve the fear of God. By perpetual abſence from public worſhip, they miſs all opportunities, which the pious wiſdom of chriſtianity has afforded them, of comparing their lives with the rules which the ſcripture contains, and awakening their attention to the preſence of God, by hearing him invoked, and joining their own voices in the common ſupplication. That careleſſneſs of the world to come, which firſt ſuffered them to omit the duties of devotion, is, by that omiſſion, hourly encreaſed; and having firſt neglected the means of holineſs, they in time do not remember them.

A great part of them whoſe hearts are thus hardened, may juſtly impute that inſenſibility to the violation of the Sabbath. He that keeps one day in the week holy, has not time to become profligate, before the returning day of recollection reinſtates his principles and renews his caution. This is the benefit of periodical worſhip. But he, to whom all days are alike, will find *no* day for prayer and repentance.

Many enjoyments, innocent in themſelves, may become dangerous by too much frequency; public ſpectacles, convivial entertainments, domeſtick games, ſports of the field, or

gay or ludicrous converſation, all of them harmleſs, and ſome of them uſeful, while they are regulated by religious prudence; may yet become pernicious when they paſs their bounds, and uſurp too much of that time which is given us that we may work out our ſalvation.

And ſurely, whatever may diminiſh the fear of God, or abate the tenderneſs of conſcience, muſt be diligently avoided by thoſe who remember what is to be explained,

Fourthly, the conſequence of hardneſs of heart.

He that hardeneth his heart ſhall fall into miſchief. Whether miſchief be conſidered as immediately ſignifying wickedneſs, or miſery, the ſenſe is eventually the ſame. Miſery is the effect of wickedneſs, and wickedneſs is the cauſe of miſery; and he that hardeneth his heart ſhall be both wicked and miſerable. Wicked he will doubtleſs be, for he that has loſt the fear of God has nothing by which he can oppoſe temptation. He has a breaſt open and expoſed, of which intereſt or voluptuouſneſs take eaſy poſſeſſion. He is the ſlave of his own deſires, and the ſport of his own paſſions. He acts without a rule of action; and he determines without any true principle of judgment. If he who fears always, who preſerves in his mind a conſtant ſenſe of the danger of ſin, is yet often aſſaulted, and ſometimes overpowered by temptation, what can be hoped for him that has the ſame temptation without the ſame defence? He who hardens his heart will certainly be wicked, and it neceſſarily follows that he will certainly be miſerable. The doom of the obſtinate and impenitent ſinner is plainly declared; it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

Let us all therefore watch our thoughts and actions; and that we may not, by hardneſs of heart, fall into miſchief, let us endeavour and pray that we may be among them that feared always, and by that fear may be prepared for everlaſting happineſs.

SERMON IV.

ISAIAH, CHAP. lviii. VER. 7, 8.

Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out, to thy house? when thou seest the naked that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?

Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily: and thy righteousness shall go before thee, the glory of the Lord shall be thy rereward.

IF the necessity of every duty is to be estimated by the frequency with which it is inculcated, and the sanctions by which it is enforced; if the great Lawgiver of the universe, whose will is immutable, and whose decrees are established for ever, may be supposed to regard, in a particular manner, the observation of those commands, which seem to be repeated only that they may be strongly impressed and secured, by an habitual submission, from violation and neglect, there is scarcely any virtue that we ought more diligently to exercise than that of compassion to the needy and distressed.

If we look into the state of mankind, and endeavour to deduce the will of God from the visible disposition of things, we find no duty more necessary to the support of order and the happiness of society, nor any of which we are more often reminded, by opportunities of practising it, or which is more strongly urged upon us by importunate solicitations and affecting objects.

If we enquire into the opinions of those men on whom God conferred superior wisdom, in the heathen world, all

their suffrages will be found united in this great point. Amidst all their wild opinions, and chimerical systems, the sallies of unguided imagination, and the errors of bewildered reason; they have all endeavoured to evince the necessity of beneficence, and agreed to assign the first rank of excellence to him, who most contributes to improve the happiness, and to soften the miseries of life.

But we, who are blessed with clearer light, and taught to know the will of our Maker, not from long deductions from variable appearances, or intricate disquisitions of fallible reason, but by messengers inspired by himself, and enabled to prove their mission, by works above the power of created beings, may spare ourselves the labour of tedious enquiries. The Holy Scriptures are in our hands; the scriptures, which are able to make us wise unto salvation; and by them we may be sufficiently informed of the extent and importance of this great duty; a duty enjoined, explained, and enforced by Moses and the prophets, by the evangelists and apostles, by the precepts of Solomon and the example of Christ.

From those to whom large possessions have been transmitted by their ancestors, or whose industry has been blessed with success, God always requires the tribute of charity; he commands that what he has given be enjoyed in imitating his bounty, in dispensing happiness, and chearing poverty, in easing the pains of disease, and lightening the burden of oppression; he commands that the superfluity of bread be dealt to the hungry; and the raiment, which the possessor cannot use, be bestowed upon the naked, and that no man turn away from his own flesh.

This is a tribute, which it is difficult to imagine that any man can be unwilling to pay, as an acknowledgment of his dependence upon the universal Benefactor, and an humble testimony of his confidence in that protection, without which the strongest foundations of human power must fail, at the first shock of adversity, and the highest fabricks of earthly grea-

nefs ſink into ruin; without which wealth is only a *floating* vapour, and policy an empty ſound.

But ſuch is the prevalence of temptations, not early reſiſted; ſuch the depravity of minds, by which unlawful deſires have been long indulged, and falſe appearances of happineſs purſued with ardour and pertinacioufneſs; ſo much are we influenced by example, and ſo diligently do we labour to deceive ourſelves, that it is not uncommon to find the *ſentiments* of benevolence almoſt extinguiſhed, and all regard to the welfare of others overborne by a perpetual attention to immediate advantage and contracted views of preſent intereſt.

When any man has ſunk into a ſtate of inſenſibility like this, when he has learned to act only by the impulſe of apparent profit, when he can look upon diſtreſs without partaking it, and hear the cries of poverty and ſickneſs without a wiſh to relieve them; when he has *ſo far diſordered his ideas* as to value wealth, without *regard* to its end, and to *amaſs*, with eagerneſs, what is of no uſe in his hands; he is, indeed, not eaſily to be reclaimed; his reaſon, as well as his paſſions, is in combination againſt his ſoul, and there is little hope that either perſuaſion will ſoften, or arguments convince him. A man, once hardened in cruelty by inveterate avarice, is ſcarcely to be conſidered as any longer human; nor is it to be hoped that any impreſſion can be made upon him, by methods applicable only to reaſonable beings. Beneficence and compaſſion can be awakened in ſuch hearts only by the operation of Divine Grace, and muſt be the effect of a miracle like that which turned the dry rock into a ſpringing well.

Let every one that conſiders this ſtate of obdurate wickedneſs, that is ſtruck with horror at the mention of a man void of pity, that feels reſentment at the name of oppreſſion, and melts with ſorrow at the voice of miſery, remember that thoſe, who have now loſt all theſe ſentiments, were originally formed with paſſions, and inſtincts, and reaſon, like his own; let him reflect, that he, who now ſtands moſt firmly, may fall by negligence, and that negligence ariſes from ſecurity. Let

him therefore observe by what gradations men sink into perdition, by what insensible deviations they wander from the ways of virtue till they are at length scarce able to return; and let him be warned by their example to avoid the original causes of depravity, and repel the first attacks of unreasonable self-love; let him meditate on the excellence of charity, and improve those seeds of benevolence, which are implanted in every mind, but which will not produce fruit without care and cultivation.

Such meditations are always necessary for the promotion of virtue; for a careless and inattentive mind easily forgets its importance, and it will be practised only with a degree of ardour proportioned to the sense of our obligations to it.

To aid such reflections, to confirm the benevolence of the liberal, and to shew those who have lived without regard to the necessities of others, the absurdity of their conduct, I shall enquire,

First, Into the nature of charity; and,

Secondly, Into the advantages arising from the exercise of it.

First, I shall enquire into the nature of charity.

By charity is to be understood every assistance of weakness, or supply of wants, produced by a desire of benefiting others, and of pleasing God. Not every act of liberality, every increase of the wealth of another, not every flow of negligent profusions, or thoughtless start of sudden munificence, is to be dignified with this venerable name. There are many motives to the appearance of bounty, very different from those of true charity, and which, with whatever success they may be imposed upon mankind, will be distinguished at the last day by Him to whom all hearts are open. It is not impossible that men, whose chief desire is esteem and applause, who court the favour of the multitude, and think fame the great end of action, may squander their wealth in such a manner that some part of it may benefit the virtuous or the miserable; but as the guilt, so the virtue of every action arises

from design; and those blessings which are bestowed by chance, will be of very little advantage to him that scattered them with no other prospect than that of hearing his own praises; praises, of which he will not be often disappointed, but of which our Lord has determined that they shall be his reward. If any man, in the distribution of his favours, finds the desire of engaging gratitude, or gaining affection, to predominate in his mind; if he finds his benevolence weakened by observing that his favours are forgotten, and that those whom he has most studiously benefited, are often least zealous for his service; he ought to remember, that he is not acting upon the proper motives of charity. For true charity arises from faith in the promises of God, and expects rewards only in a future state. To hope for our recompence in this life, is not beneficence, but usury.

And surely charity may easily subsist without temporal motives, when it is considered that it is by the exercise of charity alone that we are enabled to receive any solid advantage from present prosperity, and to appropriate to ourselves any possession beyond the possibility of losing it. Of the uncertainty of success, and the instability of greatness, we have examples every day before us. Scarcely can any man turn his eyes upon the world, without observing the sudden rotations of affairs, the ruin of the affluent, and the downfal of the high; and it may reasonably be hoped, that no man to whom opportunities of such observations occur, can forbear applying them to his own condition, and reflecting that what he now contemplates in another, he may, in a few days, experience himself.

By these reflections he must be naturally led to enquire, how he may fix such fugitive advantages; how he shall hinder his wealth from flying away, and leaving him nothing but melancholy, disappointment and remorse. This he can effect only by the practice of charity, by dealing his bread to the hungry, and bringing the poor that is cast out, to his house. By these means only he can lay up for himself treasures in

Heaven, *where neither rust nor moth doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal.* By a liberal distribution of his riches, he can place them above the reach of the spoiler, and exempt them from accident and danger; can purchase to himself that satisfaction which no power on earth can take away, and make them the means of happiness when they are no longer in his hands. He may procure, by this use of his wealth, what he will find to be obtained by no other method of applying it, an alleviation of the sorrows of age, of the pains of sickness, and of the agonies of death.

To enforce the duty of charity, it is so far from being necessary to produce any arguments, drawn from the narrow view of our condition, a view restrained to this world, that the chief reason for which it is to be practised, is the shortness and uncertainty of life. To a man who considers for what purpose he was created, and why he was placed in his present state, how short a time, at most, is allotted to his earthly duration, and how much of that time may be cut off; how can any thing give real satisfaction that terminates in this life? How can he imagine that any acquisition can deserve his labour which has no tendency to the perfection of his mind? Or how can any enjoyment engage his desires, but that of a pure conscience, and reasonable expectations of a more happy and permanent existence? Whatever superiority may distinguish us, and whatever plenty may surround us, we know that they can be possessed but a short time, and that the manner in which we employ them must determine our eternal state; and what need can there be of any other argument for the use of them, agreeable to the command of him that bestowed them? What stronger incitement can any man require to a due consideration of the poor and needy, than that the Lord will deliver him in the day of trouble; in that day when the shadow of death shall compass him about, and all the vanities of the world shall fade away; when all the comforts of this life shall forsake him, when pleasure shall no longer delight, nor power protect him? In that dreadful hour shall the

man, whose care has been extended to the general happiness of mankind, whose charity has rescued sickness from the grave, and poverty from the dungeon, who has heard the groans of the aged struggling with misfortunes, and the cries of infants languishing with hunger, find favour in the sight of the great Author of society, and his recompense shall flow upon him from the fountain of mercy; he shall stand without fear, on the brink of life, and pass into eternity with an humble confidence of finding that mercy which he has never denied. His righteousness shall go before him, and the glory of the Lord shall be his rereward.

These blessings and these rewards are to be gained by the due use of riches; but they are not confined to the rich, or unattainable by those whom Providence has placed in lower stations. Charity is an universal duty, which it is in every man's power sometimes to practise; since every degree of assistance given to another, upon proper motives, is an act of charity; and there is scarcely any man in such a state of imbecility as that he may not, on some occasions, benefit his neighbour. He that cannot relieve the poor, may instruct the ignorant; and he that cannot attend the sick, may reclaim the vicious. He that can give little assistance himself, may yet perform the duty of charity, by inflaming the ardour of others, and recommending the petitions, which he cannot grant, to those who have more to bestow. The widow that shall give her mite to the treasury, the poor man who shall bring to the thirsty a cup of cold water, shall not lose their reward.

And that this reward is not without reason decreed to the beneficent, and that the duty of charity is not exalted above its natural dignity and importance, will appear by considering,

Secondly, The benefits arising from the exercise of charity.

The chief advantage which is received by mankind from the practice of charity, is the promotion of virtue, amongst those who are most exposed to such temptations as it is not easy to surmount; temptations of which no man can say that

he should be able to resist them, and of which it is not easy for any one that has not known them, to estimate the force and represent the danger.

We see, every day, men blessed with abundance, and revelling in delight, yet overborne by ungovernable desires of increasing their acquisitions; and breaking through the boundaries of religion, to pile heaps on heaps, and add one superfluity to another, to obtain only nominal advantages and imaginary pleasures.

For these we see friendships broken, justice violated, and nature forgotten; we see crimes committed, without the prospect of obtaining any positive pleasure, or removing any real pain. We see men toiling through meanness and guilt, to obtain that which they can enjoy only in idea, and which will supply them with nothing real which they do not already abundantly possess.

If men, formed by education and enlightened by experience, men whose observations of the world cannot but have shewn them the necessity of virtue, and who are able to discover the enormity of wickedness by tracing its original, and pursuing its consequences, can fall before such temptations, and, in opposition to knowledge and conviction, prefer, to the happiness of pleasing God, the flatteries of dependants, or the smiles of power; what may not be expected from him who is pushed forward into sin by the impulse of poverty, who lives in continual want of what he sees wasted by thousands in negligent extravagance, and whose pain is every moment aggravated by the contempt of those whom nature has subjected to the same necessities with himself, and who are only his superiors by that wealth which they know not how to possess with moderation or decency?

How strongly may such a man be tempted to declare war upon the prosperous and the great! With what obstinacy and fury may he rush on from one outrage to another, impelled on one part by the pressure of necessity, and attracted on the other by the prospect of happiness; of happiness, which he sees

sufficient to elevate those that possess it above the consideration of their own nature, and to turn them away from their own flesh; that happiness, which appears greater by being compared with his own misery, and which he admires the more because he cannot approach it. He that finds in himself every natural power of enjoyment, will envy the tables of the luxurious, and the splendour of the proud; he who feels the cold of nakedness, and the faintness of hunger, cannot but be provoked to snatch that bread which is devoured by excess, and that raiment which is only worn as the decoration of vanity. Resentment may easily combine with want, and incite him to return neglect with violence.

Such are the temptations of poverty; and who is there that can say, that he has not sometimes forsaken virtue upon weaker motives? Let any man reflect upon the snares to which poverty exposes virtue, and remember how certainly one crime makes way for another, till at last all distinction of good and evil is obliterated; and he will easily discover the necessity of charity to preserve a great part of mankind from the most atrocious wickedness.

The great rule of action, by which we are directed to do to others whatever we would that others should do to us, may be extended to God himself; whatever we ask of God, we ought to be ready to bestow on our neighbour; if we pray to be forgiven, we must forgive those that trespass against us; and is it not equally reasonable, when we implore from Providence our daily bread, that we deal our bread to the hungry; and that we rescue others from being betrayed by want into sin, when we pray that we may not ourselves be led into temptation?

Poverty, for the greatest part, produces ignorance, and ignorance facilitates the attack of temptation. For how should any man resist the solicitations of appetite, or the influence of passion, without any sense of their guilt, or dread of the punishment? How should he avoid the paths of vice, who never was directed to the way of virtue.

For this reason, no method of charity is more efficacious than that which at once enlightens ignorance and relieves poverty, that implants virtue in the mind, and wards off the blasts of indigence that might destroy it in the bloom. Such is the charity of which an opportunity is now offered; charity, by which those who would, probably, without assistance, be the burdens or terrors of the community by growing up in idleness and vice, are enabled to support themselves by useful employments, and glorify God by reasonable service.

Such are the general motives which the religion of Jesus affords to the general exercise of charity, and such are the particular motives for our laying hold of the opportunity which Providence has this day put into our power for the practice of it; motives no less than the hope of everlasting happiness, and the fear of punishment which shall never end. Such incitements are surely sufficient to quicken the slowest, and animate the coldest; and if there can be imagined any place in which they must be more eminently prevalent, it must be the place* where we now reside. The numerous frequenters of this place constitute a mixed assemblage of the happy and the miserable. Part of this audience has resorted hither to alleviate the miseries of sickness, and part, to divert the satiety of pleasure; part, because they are disabled, by diseases, to prosecute the employment of their station; and part, because their station has allotted them, in their own opinion, no other business than to pursue their pleasures. Part have exhausted the medicines, and part have worn out the delights of every other place; and these contrary conditions are so mingled together, that in few places are the miseries of life so severely felt, or its pleasures more luxuriously enjoyed.

To each of these states of life may the precepts of charity be enforced with eminent propriety, and unanswerable arguments. Those whose only complaint is a surfeit of felicity, and whose fearless and confident gaiety brings them hither, rather to waste health than to repair it, cannot surely be so in-

* *Bath.*

tent upon the constant succession of amusements which vanity and affluence have provided, as not sometimes to turn their thoughts upon those whom poverty and ignorance have cut off from enjoyment, and consigned a prey to wickedness, to misery and to want. If their amusements afford them the satisfaction which the eager repetition of them seems to declare, they must certainly pity those who live in sight of so much happiness, which they can only view from a distance, but can never reach; and those whom they pity, they cannot surely hear the promises made to charity without endeavouring to relieve. (But if, as the wisest among the votaries of pleasure have confessed, they feel themselves unsatisfied and deluded; if, as they own, their ardour is kept up by dissimulation, and they lay aside their appearance of felicity when they retire from the eyes of those among whom they desire to propagate the deceit; if they feel that they have wasted life without possessing it; and know that they shall rise to-morrow to chase an empty good which they have often grasped at, but could never hold; they may surely spare something for the purchase of solid satisfaction, and cut off part of that expense by which nothing is procured, for the sake of giving to others those necessaries which the common wants of our being demand, and by the distribution of which they may lay up some treasures of happiness against that day which is stealing upon them, the day of age, of sickness and of death, in which they shall be able to reflect with pleasure on no other part of their time past here, but that which was spent in the duties of charity. But if these shall harden their dispositions, if these shall withhold their hands, let them not amuse themselves with the general excuses, or dream that any plea of inability will be accepted from those who squander wealth upon trifles, and trust sums, that might relieve the wants of multitudes, to the skill of play, and the uncertainties of chance.)

To those to whom languishment and sickness have shewn the instability of all human happiness, I hope it will not be requisite to enforce the necessity of securing to themselves a

state of unshaken security and unchangeable enjoyment. To inculcate the shortness of life to those who feel hourly decays; or to expatiate on the miseries of disease and poverty to them whom pain, perhaps, at this instant is dragging to the grave, would be a needless waste of that time which their condition admonishes them to spend, not in hearing, but in practising their duty. And of sickness charity seems the peculiar employment, because it is an act of piety which can be practised with such slight and transient attention as pain and faintness may allow. To the sick, therefore, I may be allowed to pronounce the last summons to this mighty work which, perhaps, the Divine Providence will allow them to hear. Remember thou! that now fainest under the weight of long continued maladies, that to thee, more emphatically, the night cometh in which no man can work; and therefore say not to him that asketh thee, "Go away now, and to-morrow I will give;" To-morrow? To-morrow is to *all* uncertain, to *thee* almost hopeless; to-*day* if thou wilt hear the voice of God calling thee to repentance, and by repentance to charity; harden not thy heart, but what thou knowest that in thy last moment thou shalt wish done, make haste to do, lest thy last moment be now upon thee.

And let us all, at all times and in all places, remember, that they who have given food to the hungry, raiment to the naked, and instruction to the ignorant, shall be numbered by the Son of God amongst the blessed of the Father.

SERMON V.

NEHEMIAH. CHAP. IX. VER. 33.

Howbeit thou art just in all that is brought upon us, for thou hast done right, but we have done wickedly.

THERE is nothing upon which more writers, in all ages, have laid out their abilities, than the miseries of life; and it affords no pleasing reflections to discover that a subject so little agreeable is not yet exhausted.

Some have endeavoured to engage us in the contemplation of the evils of life for a very wise and good end. They have proposed, by laying before us the uncertainty of prosperity, the vanity of pleasure and the inquietudes of power, the difficult attainment of most earthly blessings, and the short duration of them all, to divert our thoughts from the glittering follies and tempting delusions that surround us, to an enquiry after more certain and permanent felicity; felicity, not subject to be interrupted by sudden vicissitudes, or impaired by the malice of the revengeful, the caprice of the inconstant, or the envy of the ambitious. They have endeavoured to demonstrate, and have in reality demonstrated to all those who will steal a few moments from noise, and show, and luxury, to attend to reason and to truth, that nothing is worthy our ardent wishes, or intense solicitude, that terminates in this state of existence, and that those only make the true use of life that employ it in obtaining the favour of God, and securing everlasting happiness.

Others have taken occasion from the dangers that surround, and the troubles that perplex us, to dispute the wisdom or just-

tice of the Governor of the world, or to murmur at the laws of Divine Providence; as the present state of the world, the disorder and confusion of every thing about us, the casual and certain evils to which we are exposed, and the disquiet and disgust which either accompany, or follow those few pleasures that are within our reach, seem, in their opinion, to carry no marks of infinite benignity. This has been the reasoning by which the wicked and profligate, in all ages, have attempted to harden their hearts against the reproaches of conscience, and delude others into a participation of their crimes. By this argument fresh minds have been betrayed into doubts and distrust, and decoyed by degrees into a dangerous state of suspense, though perhaps never betrayed to absolute infidelity. For few men have been made infidels by argument and reflection; their actions are not generally the result of their reasonings, but their reasonings of their actions. Yet these reasonings, though they are not strong enough to pervert a good mind, may yet, when they coincide with interest, and are assisted by prejudice, contribute to confirm a man, already corrupted, in his impieties, and at least retard his reformation, if not entirely obstruct it.

Besides, notions, thus derogatory from the providence of God, tend, even in the best men, if not timely eradicated, to weaken those impressions of reverence and gratitude which are necessary to add warmth to his devotions and vigour to his virtue; for as the force of corporeal motion is weakened by every obstruction, though it may not be entirely overcome by it, so the operations of the mind are by every false notion impeded and embarrassed, and though they are not wholly diverted or suppressed, proceed at least with less regularity and with less celerity.

But these doubts may easily be removed and these arguments confuted, by a calm and impartial attention to religion and to reason; it will appear upon examination, that though the world be full of misery and disorder, yet God is not to be charged with disregard of his creatures; that if we suffer, we

suffer by our own fault, and that *he has done right, but we have done wickedly.*

We are informed by the scriptures, that God is not the author of our present state, that when he created man he created him for happiness; happiness indeed dependent upon his own choice, and to be preserved by his own conduct; for such must necessarily be the happiness of every reasonable being: that this happiness was forfeited by a breach of the conditions to which it was annexed, and that the posterity of him that broke the covenant were involved in the consequences of his fault. Thus religion shews us that physical and moral evil entered the world together; and reason and experience assure us, that they continue for the most part so closely united that, to avoid misery, we must avoid sin, and that while it is in our power to be virtuous it is in our power to be happy, at least to be happy to such a degree as may have little room for murmur and complaints.

Complaints are doubtless irrational in themselves, and unjust with respect to God, if the remedies of the evils we lament are in our hands; for what more can be expected from the beneficence of our Creator, than that he should place good and evil before us, and then direct us in our choice?

That God has not been sparing of his bounties to mankind, or left them, even since the original transgression of his command, in a state so calamitous as discontent and melancholy have represented it, will evidently appear, if we reflect,

First, How few of the evils of life can justly be ascribed to God.

Secondly, How far a general piety might exempt any community from those evils.

Thirdly, How much, in the present corrupt state of the world, particular men may, by the practice of the duties of religion, promote their own happiness.

First, How few of the evils of life can justly be ascribed to God.

In examining what part of our present misery is to be im-

puted to God; we must carefully distinguish that which is actually appointed by him, from that which is only permitted, or that which is the consequence of something done by ourselves, and could not be prevented but by the interruption of those general and settled laws, which we term the course of nature, or the established order of the universe. Thus it is decreed by God, that all men should die; and therefore the death of each man may justly be ascribed to God; but the circumstances and time of his death are very much in his own power, or in the power of others. When a good man falls by the hand of an assassin, or is condemned by the testimony of false witnesses, or the sentence of a corrupt judge; his death may, in some measure, be called the work of God, but his murder is the action of men. That he was mortal is the effect of the divine decree; but that he was deprived of life unjustly, is the crime of his enemies.

If we examine all the afflictions of mind, body, and estate, by this rule, we shall find God not otherwise accessary to them, than as he works no miracles to prevent them; as he suffers men to be masters of themselves, and restrains them only by coercions applied to their reason. If God should, by a particular exertion of his omnipotence, hinder murder or oppression, no man could then be a murderer or an oppressor, because he would be withheld from it by an irresistible power; but then that power which prevented crimes would destroy virtue, for virtue is the consequence of choice. Men would be no longer rational, or would be rational to no purpose, because their actions would not be the result of free-will, determined by moral motives; but the settled and predestined motions of a machine impelled by necessity.

Thus it appears that God would not act as the governor of rational and moral agents, if he should lay any other restraints upon them than the hope of rewards, or fear of punishments; and that to destroy or obviate the consequences of human actions, would be to destroy the present constitution of the world.

When, therefore, any man suffers pain from an injury offered him, that pain is not the act of God, but the effect of a crime, to which his enemy was determined by his own choice. He was created susceptible of pain, but not necessarily subjected to that particular injury which he now feels, and he is therefore not to charge God with his afflictions. The materials for building are naturally combustible; but when a *city* is fired by incendiaries, God is not the author of its destruction.

God may indeed, by special acts of Providence, sometimes hinder the designs of bad men from being successfully executed, or the execution of them from producing such consequences as it naturally tends to; but this, whenever it is done, is a real, though not always a visible miracle, and is not to be expected in the ordinary occurrences of life, or the common transactions of the world.

In making an estimate, therefore, of the miseries that arise from the disorders of the body, we must consider how many diseases proceed from our own lazinesS, intemperance, or negligence; how many the vices or follies of our ancestors have transmitted to us, and beware of imputing to God the consequences of luxury, riot and debauchery.

There are indeed distempers which no caution can secure us from, and which appear to be more immediately the strokes of Heaven; but these are not of the most painful or lingering kind; they are, for the most part, acute and violent, and quickly terminate either in recovery or death; and it is always to be remembered, that nothing but wickedness makes death an evil.

Nor are the disquietudes of the mind less frequently excited by ourselves. Pride is the general source of our infelicity. A man that has an high opinion of his own merits, of the extent of his capacity, of the depth of his penetration, and the force of his eloquence, naturally forms schemes of employment and promotion adequate to those abilities he conceives himself possessed of; he exacts from others the same esteem

which he pays to himself, and imagines his deserts disregarded if they are not rewarded to the extent of his wishes. He claims more than he has a right to hope for, finds his exorbitant demands rejected, retires to obscurity and melancholy, and charges Heaven with his disappointments.

Men are very seldom disappointed, except when their desires are immoderate, or when they suffer their passions to overpower their reason, and dwell upon delightful scenes of future honours, power, or riches, till they mistake probabilities for certainties, or wild wishes for rational expectations. If such men, when they awake from these voluntary dreams, find the pleasing phantom vanish away, what can they blame but their own folly?

With no greater reason can we impute to Providence the fears and anxieties that harrass and distract us; for they arise from too close an adherence to those things, from which we are commanded to disengage our affections. We fail of being happy, because we determine to obtain felicity by means different from those which God hath appointed. We are forbidden to be too solicitous about future events; and is the author of that prohibition to be accused, because men make themselves miserable by disregarding it?

Poverty indeed is not always the effect of wickedness, it may often be the consequence of virtue; but it is not certain that poverty is an evil. If we exempt the poor man from all the miseries to which his condition exposes him from the wickedness of others, if we secure him from the cruelty of oppression, and the contumelies of pride; if we suppose him to rate no enjoyment of this life beyond its real and intrinsic value, and to indulge no desire more than reason and religion allow; the inferiority of his station will very little diminish his happiness; and therefore the poverty of the virtuous reflects no reproach upon Providence. But poverty, like many other miseries of life, is often little more than an imaginary calamity. Men often call themselves poor, not because

they want necessaries, but because they have not more than they want. This indeed is not always the case, nor ought we ever to harden our hearts against the cries of those who implore our assistance, by supposing that they feel less than they express; but let us all relieve the necessitous according to our abilities, and real poverty will soon be banished out of the world.

To these general heads may be reduced almost all the calamities that imbitter the life of man. To enumerate particular evils would be of little use. It is evident that most of our miseries are, either imaginary, or the consequences, either of our own faults, or the faults of others; and that it is therefore worthy of enquiry,

Secondly, how far a general piety might exempt any community from those evils.

It is an observation very frequently made, that there is more tranquillity and satisfaction diffused through the inhabitants of uncultivated and savage countries, than is to be met with in nations filled with wealth and plenty, polished with civility, and governed by laws. It is found happy to be free from contention, though that exemption be obtained by having nothing to contend for; and an equality of condition, though that condition be far from eligible, conduces more to the peace of society, than an established and legal subordination; in which every man is perpetually endeavouring to exalt himself to the rank above him, though by degrading others already in possession of it; and every man exerting his efforts to hinder his inferiors from rising to the level with himself. It appears that it is better to have no property, than to be in perpetual apprehensions of fraudulent artifices, or open invasions; and that the security arising from a regular administration of government, is not equal to that which is produced by the absence of ambition, envy, or discontent.

Thus pleasing is the prospect of savage countries, merely from the ignorance of vice, even without the knowledge of virtue; thus happy are they, amidst all the hardships and dif-

tresses that attend a state of nature, because they are in a great measure free from those which men bring upon one another.

But a community, in which virtue should generally prevail, of which every member should fear God with his whole heart, and love his neighbour as himself, where every man should labour to make himself *perfect, even as his Father which is in Heaven is perfect*, and endeavour with his utmost diligence to imitate the divine justice and benevolence, would have no reason to envy those nations, whose quiet is the effect of their ignorance.

If we consider it with regard to public happiness, it would be opulent without luxury, and powerful without faction; its counsels would be steady, because they would be just; and its efforts vigorous because they would be united. The governors would have nothing to fear from the turbulence of the people, nor the people any thing to apprehend from the ambition of their governors. The encroachments of foreign enemies they could not always avoid, but would certainly repulse, for scarcely any civilized nation has been ever enslaved, till it was first corrupted.

With regard to private men, not only that happiness, which necessarily descends to particulars from the public prosperity, would be enjoyed, but even those blessings which constitute the felicity of domestic life, and are less closely connected with the general good. Every man would be industrious to improve his property, because he would be in no danger of seeing his improvements torn from him. Every man would assist his neighbour, because he would be certain of receiving assistance if he should himself be attacked by necessity. Every man would endeavour after merit, because merit would always be rewarded. Every tie of friendship and relation would add to happiness, because it would not be subject to be broken by envy, rivalship, or suspicion. Children would honour their parents, because all parents would be virtuous; all parents would love their children, because all children would be obedient. The grief which we naturally feel

as the death of those that are dear to us, could not perhaps be wholly prevented, but would be much more moderate than in the present state of things, because no man could ever want a friend, and his loss would therefore be less, because his grief, like his other passions, would be regulated by his duty. Even the relations of subjection would produce no uneasiness, because insolence would be separated from power, and discontent from inferiority. Difference of opinions would never disturb this community, because every man would dispute for truth alone, look upon the ignorance of others with compassion, and reclaim them from their errors with tenderness and modesty. Persecution would not be heard of among them, because there would be no pride on one side, nor obstinacy on the other. Disputes about property would seldom happen, because no man would grow rich by injuring another; and, when they did happen, they would be quickly terminated, because each party would be equally desirous of a just sentence. All care and solicitude would be almost banished from this happy region, because no man would either have false friends or public enemies. The immoderate desire of riches would be extinguished, where there was no vanity to be gratified. The fear of poverty would be dispelled, where there was no man suffered to want what was necessary to his support, or proportioned to his deserts. Such would be the state of a community generally virtuous, and this happiness would probably be derived to future generations; since the earliest impressions would be in favour of virtue, since those, to whom the care of education should be committed, would make themselves venerable by the observation of their own precepts, and the minds of the young and unexperienced would not be tainted with false notions, nor their conduct influenced by bad examples.

Such, is the state at which any community may arrive by the general practice of the duties of religion. And can Providence be accused of cruelty or negligence, when such happiness as this is within our power? Can man be said to have

received his existence as a punishment, or a curse, when he may attain such a state as this; when even this is only preparatory to greater happiness, and the same course of life will secure him from misery, both in this world and in a future state?

Let no man charge this prospect of things with being a train of airy phantoms; a visionary scene, with which a gay imagination may be amused in solitude and ease, but which the first survey of the world will shew him to be nothing more than a pleasing delusion. Nothing has been mentioned which would not certainly be produced in any nation by a general piety. To effect all this no miracle is required; men need only unite their endeavours, and exert those abilities which God has conferred upon them, in conformity to the laws of religion.

To general happiness, indeed, is required a general concurrence in virtue; but we are not to delay the amendment of our own lives, in expectation of this favourable juncture. An universal reformation must be begun somewhere, and every man ought to be ambitious of being the first. He that does not promote it, retards it; for every man must, by his conversation, do either good or hurt. Let every man, therefore, endeavour to make the world happy, by a strict performance of his duty to God and man, and the mighty work will soon be accomplished.

Governors have yet a harder task; they have not only their own actions, but those of others to regulate, and are not only chargeable with their own faults, but with all those which they neglect to prevent or punish. As they are intrusted with the government for the sake of the people, they are under the strongest obligations to advance their happiness, which they can only do by the encouragement of virtue.

But since the care of governors may be frustrated, since public happiness, which must be the result of public virtue, seems to be at a great distance from us, let us consider,

Thirdly, How much, in the present corrupt state of the world, particular men may, by the practice of the duties of religion, promote their own happiness.

He is very ignorant of the nature of happiness, who imagines it to consist wholly in the outward circumstances of life, which being in themselves transient and variable, and generally dependent upon the will of others, can never be the true basis of a solid satisfaction. To be wealthy, to be honoured, to be loved, or to be feared, is not always to be happy. The man who considers himself as a being accountable to God, as a being sent into the world only to secure immortal happiness by his obedience to those laws which he has received from his Creator, will not be very solicitous about his present condition, which will soon give way to a state permanent and unchangeable, in which nothing will avail him but his innocence, or disturb him but his crimes. While this reflection is predominant in the mind, all the good and evil of life sinks into nothing. While he presses forward towards eternal felicity, honours and reproaches are equally contemptible. If he be injured, he will soon cease to feel the wrong; if he be calumniated, the day is coming in which all the nations of the earth, and all the host of heaven shall be witnesses of his justification. If his friends forsake or betray him, he alleviates his concern by considering that the divine promises are never broken, and that the favour of God can only be forfeited by his own fault. In all his calamities he remembers that it is in his own power to make them subservient to his own advantage, and that patience is one of those virtues which he is commanded to practise, and which God has determined to reward. That man can never be miserable to whom persecution is a blessing; nor can his tranquillity be interrupted who places all his happiness in his prospect of eternity.

Thus it appears that, by the practice of our duty, even our present state may be made pleasing and desirable; and that if we languish under calamities, they are brought upon

us, not by the immediate hand of Providence, but by our own folly and disobedience; that happiness will be diffused as virtue prevails; and *that God has done right, but we have done wickedly.*

SERMON VI.

PROVERBS, CHAP. xii. VER. 2.

When Pride cometh, then cometh Shame: but with the Lowly is Wisdom.

THE writings of Solomon are filled with such observations upon the nature and life of man, as were the result of long experience, assisted with every advantage of mind and fortune; an experience that had made him acquainted with the actions, passions, virtues and vices of all ranks, ages and denominations of mankind, and enabled him, with the divine assistance, to leave to succeeding ages a collection of precepts that, if diligently attended to, will conduct us safe in the paths of life.

Of the ancient sages of the heathen world, so often talked of and so loudly applauded, there is recorded little more than single maxims, which they comprised in few words, and often inculcated; for these they were honoured by their contemporaries, and still continue reverenced and admired; nor would it be either justice or gratitude to depreciate their characters, since every discoverer or propagator of truth is undoubtedly a benefactor to the world. But surely if single sentences could procure them the epithet of *wise*, Solomon may, for this collection of important counsels, *justly claim the title of the wisest amongst the sons of men.*

Among all the vices against which he has cautioned us (and he has scarcely left one untouched) there is none upon which he animadverts with more severity, or to which he more frequently recals our attention, by reiterated reflections, than the

vice of *pride*; for which there may be many reasons assigned, but, more particularly, two seem to deserve our consideration; the first drawn from the extensiveness of the sin; the other from the circumstances of the preacher.

The first is the extensiveness of the sin.

Pride is a corruption that seems almost originally engrafted in our nature; it exerts itself in our first years, and, without continual endeavours to suppress it, influences our last. Other vices tyrannize over particular ages, and triumph in particular countries. Rage is the failing of youth, and avarice of age; revenge is the predominant passion of one country, and inconstancy the characteristic of another; but pride is the native of every country, infects every climate, and corrupts every nation. It ranges equally through the gardens of the east, and the deserts of the south, and reigns no less in the cavern of the savage, than in the palace of the epicure. It mingles with all our other vices, and without the most constant and anxious care will mingle also with our virtues. It is no wonder, therefore, that Solomon so frequently directs us to avoid this fault, to which we are all so liable, since nothing is more agreeable to reason, than that precepts of the most general use should be most frequently inculcated.

The second reason may be drawn from the circumstances of the preacher.

Pride was probably a crime to which Solomon himself was most violently tempted; and indeed it might have been much more easily imagined that he would have fallen into this sin than into some others of which he was guilty, since he was placed in every circumstance that could expose him to it. He was a king absolute and independent, and by consequence surrounded with sycophants ready to second the first motions of self-love, and blow the sparks of vanity; to echo all the applauses, and suppress all the murmurs of the people; to comply with every proposal, and flatter every failing. These are the tempters to which kings have been always exposed, and whose snares few kings have been able to overcome.

But Solomon had not only the pride of royalty to surpass, but the pride of prosperity, of knowledge and of wisdom; each of them able to subdue the virtue of most men; to poisoate their minds, and hold their reason in captivity. Well might Solomon more diligently warn us against a sin which had assaulted him in so many different forms. Could any superiority to the rest of the world make pride excusable, it might have been pardoned in Solomon; but he has been so far from allowing it either in himself or others, that he has left a perpetual attestation in favour of humility, *that when pride cometh then cometh shame, but with the lowly is wisdom.*

This assertion I shall endeavour to explain and confirm,

First, by considering the nature of pride in general, with its attendants and consequences.

Secondly, by examining some of the usual motives to pride, and shewing how little can be pleaded in excuse of it.

Thirdly, by shewing the amiableness and excellence of humility.

First, by considering in general the nature of pride, with its attendants and consequences.

Pride, simply considered, is an immoderate degree of self-esteem, or an over-value set upon a man by himself, and, like most other vices, is founded originally on an intellectual falsehood. But this definition sets this vice in the fairest light, and separates it from all its consequences, by considering man without relation to society, and independent of all outward circumstances. Pride, thus defined, is only the seed of that complicated sin against which we are cautioned in the text. It is the pride of a solitary being, and the subject of scholastic disquisitions, not of a practical discourse.

In speculation, pride may be considered as ending where it began, and exerting no influence beyond the bosom in which it dwells; but in real life and the course of affairs, pride will always be attended with kindred passions, and produce effects equally injurious to others, and destructive to itself.

He that overvalues himself will undervalue others, and he that undervalues others will oppress them. To this fancied superiority it is owing, that tyrants have squandered the lives of millions, and looked unconcerned on the miseries of war. It is indeed scarcely credible, it would without experience be absolutely incredible, that a man should carry destruction and slaughter round the world, lay cities in ashes, and put nations to the sword, without one pang or one tear; that we should feel no reluctance at seizing the possessions of another, at robbing parents of their children, and shortening or embittering innumerable lives. Yet this fatal, this dreadful effect has pride been able to produce. Pride has been able to harden the heart against compassion, and stop the ears against the cries of misery.

In this manner does pride operate, when unhappily united with power and dominion; and has in the lower ranks of mankind similar, though not equal effects. It makes masters cruel and imperious, and magistrates insolent and partial. It produces contempt and injuries, and dissolves the bond of society.

Nor is this species of pride more hurtful to the world than destructive to itself. The oppressor unites heaven and earth against him: if a private man, he at length becomes the object of universal hatred and reproach; and if a prince, the neighbouring monarchs combine to his ruin. So that, *when pride cometh, then cometh shame; but with the lowly is wisdom.*

He that sets too high a value upon his own merits, will of course think them ill rewarded with his present condition. He will endeavour to exalt his fortune and his rank above others, in proportion as his deserts are superiour to theirs. He will conceive his virtues obscured by his fortune, lament that his great abilities lie useless and unobserved for want of a sphere of action, in which he might exert them in their full extent. Once fired with these notions, he will attempt to increase his fortune and enlarge his sphere; and how few there

are that profecute fuch attempts with innocence, a very transient obfervation will fufficiently inform us.

Every man has remarked the indirect methods made ufe of in the purfuit of wealth; a purfuit for the moft part prompted by pride; for to what end is an ample fortune generally coveted? Not that the poffeffor may have it in his power to relieve diftrefs or recompenfe virtue; but that he may diftinguifh himfelf from the herd of mankind by expenfive vices, foreign luxuries, and a pompous equipage. To pride therefore muft be afcribed moft of the fraud, injuftice, violence and extortion by which wealth is frequently acquired.

Another concomitant of pride is envy, or the defire of debafing others. A proud man is uneafy and diffatisfied, while any of thofe applaufes are beftowed on another which he is defirous of himfelf. On this account he never fails of exerting all his art to deftroy or obftruct a rifing character. His inferiors he endeavours to depref, left they fhould become his equals; and his equals, not only becaufe they are fo, but left they fhould in time become his fuperiors. For this end he circulates the whifper of malevolence, aggravates the tale of calumny, and affifts the clamour of defamation; oppofes in public the juftefl defigns, and in private depreciates the moft uncontefted virtues.

Another confequence of immoderate felf-efteem is an infatiable defire of propagating in others the favourable opinion he entertains of himfelf. No proud man is fatisfied with being fingly his own admirer; his excellencies muft receive the honour of the public fuffrage. He therefore tortures his invention for means to make himfelf confpicuous, and to draw the eyes of the world upon him. It is impoffible, and would be here improper, to enumerate all the fictitious qualities, all the petty emulations and laborious trifles to which this appetite, this eagernefs of diftinction, has given birth in men of narrow views and mean attainments. But who can without horror think on thofe wretches who attempt to raife a character by fuperiority of guilt? who endeavour to excel in vice

and outvie each other in debauchery? Yet thus far can pride infatuate the mind; and extinguish the light of reason.

But for the most part it is ordered by Providence, that the schemes of the ambitious are disappointed, the calumnies of the envious detected, and false pretences to reputation ridiculed and exposed, so that still *when pride cometh, then cometh shame: but with the lowly is wisdom.*

I am now to consider, in the second place, some of the usual motives to pride, and show how little they can be pleaded in excuse of it.

A superior being that should look down upon the disorder, confusion and corruption of our world, that should observe the shortness of our lives, the weakness of our bodies, the continual accidents or injuries to which we are subject, the violence of our passions, the irregularity of our conduct, and the transitory state of every thing about us, would hardly believe there could be among us such a vice as pride, or that any human being should need to be cautioned against being too much elated with his present state. Yet so it is that, however weak or wicked we may be, we fix our eyes on some other that is represented by our self-love to be weaker, or more wicked, than ourselves, and grow proud upon the comparison. Thus, in the midst of danger and uncertainty, we see many intoxicated with the pride of prosperity; a prosperity that is hourly exposed to be disturbed, a prosperity that lies often at the mercy of a treacherous friend, or unfaithful servant, a prosperity which certainly cannot last long, but must soon be ended by the hand of death.

To consider this motive to pride more attentively, let us examine what it is to be prosperous. To be prosperous, in the common acceptation, is to have a large or an increasing fortune, great numbers of friends and dependants, and to be high in the esteem of the world in general. But do these things constitute the happiness of a man? of a being accountable to his Creator for his conduct, and, according to the account he shall give, designed to exist eternally in a future

ſtate of happineſs, or miſery? What is the proſperity of ſuch a ſtate, but the approbation of that God, on whoſe ſentence futurity depends? But neither wealth, friendſhips, or honours, are proofs of that approbation, or means neceſſary to procure it. They often endanger, but ſeldom promote, the future happineſs of thoſe that poſſeſs them. And can pride be inſpired by ſuch proſperity as this?

Even with regard to the preſent life, pride is a very dangerous aſſociate to greatneſs. A proud man is oppoſed in his riſe, hated in his elevation, and inſulted in his fall. He may have dependants, but can have no friends; and paraſites, but no ingenuous companions.

Another common motive to pride is knowledge, a motive equally weak, vain and idle, with the former. Learning, indeed, imperfect as it is, may contribute to many great and noble ends, and may be called in to the aſſiſtance of religion; as it is too often perverſely employed againſt it, it is of uſe to diſplay the greatneſs, and vindicate the juſtice, of the Almighty; to explain the difficulties, and enforce the proofs of religion. And the ſmall advances that may be made in ſcience are of themſelves ſome proof of a future ſtate, ſince they ſhew that God, who can be ſuppoſed to make nothing in vain, has given us faculties evidently ſuperior to the buſineſs of this preſent world. And this is perhaps one reaſon, why our intellectual powers are in this life of ſo great extent as they are.

But how little reaſon have we to boaſt of our knowledge, when we only gaze and wonder at the ſurfaces of things! when the wiſeſt and moſt arrogant philoſopher knows not how a grain of corn is generated, or why a ſtone falls to the ground! But were our knowledge far greater than it is, let us yet remember that goodneſs, not knowledge, is the happineſs of man! The day will come, it will come quickly, when it ſhall profit us more to have ſubdued one proud thought, than to have numbered the Hoſt of Heaven.

There is another more dangerous ſpecies of pride, ariſing from a conſciouſneſs of virtue; ſo watchful is the enemy of

our souls, and so deceitful are our own hearts, that too often a victory over one sinful inclination exposes us to be conquered by another. Spiritual pride represents a man to himself beloved by his Creator in a particular degree, and, of consequence, inclines him to think others not so high in his favour as himself. This is an error, into which weak minds are sometimes apt to fall, not so much from the assurance that they have been steady in the practice of justice, righteousness and mercy, as that they have been punctually observant of some external acts of devotion. This kind of pride is generally accompanied with great uncharitableness, and severe censures of others, and may obstruct the great duty of repentance. But it may be hoped, that a sufficient remedy against this sin may be easily found, by reminding those who are infected with it, that the blood of Christ was poured out upon the cross to make their best endeavours acceptable to God. And that they, whose sins require such an expiation, have little reason to boast of their virtue.

Having thus proved the unreasonableness, folly and odious nature, of pride, I am, in the last place, to shew the amiableness and excellence of humility.

Upon this head I need not be long, since every argument against any vice is equally an argument in favour of the contrary virtue; and whoever proves the folly of being proud, shews, at the same time, *that with the lowly there is wisdom*. But, to evince beyond opposition the excellence of this virtue, we may in few words observe, that the life of our Lord was one continued exercise of humility. The son of God condescended to take our nature upon him, to become subject to pain, to bear, from his birth, the inconveniences of poverty, and to wander from city to city, amidst opposition, reproach and calumny. He disdained not to converse with publicans and sinners, to minister to his own disciples, and to weep at the miseries of his own creatures. He submitted to insults and revilings, and, being led like a lamb to the slaughter, opened not his mouth. At length, having borne all the cruel treat-

ment that malice could suggest, or power inflict, he suffered the most lingering and ignominious death.

God of his infinite mercy grant that, by imitating his humility, we may be partakers of his merits! To whom, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, be ascribed, as is most due, all honour, adoration and praise, now and ever! Amen.

SERMON VII.

JEREMIAH, CHAP. vi. VER. 16.

Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls. But they said, we will not walk therein.

THAT almost every age, from the beginning of the world, has been eminently marked out and distinguished from the rest by some peculiar character, by particular modes of thinking, or methods of acting, then almost universally prevalent, is evident from the histories of all nations. At one time, the whole world has bowed, without repining, to despotic power and absolute dominion; at another, not only the licentious and oppressive tyranny of governors has been restrained, but just and lawful authority trampled upon and insulted: at one time, all regard for private interest has been absorbed and lost in the concern for the welfare of the public; to which virtue itself has been made a sacrifice; at another, every heart has been engrossed by low views, and every sentiment of the mind has been contracted into the narrow compass of self-love. Thus have vice and virtue, wisdom and folly, or perhaps only different follies and opposite vices, alternately prevailed; thus have mankind rushed from one error to another, and suffered equally by both extremes.

These changes of conduct or opinion may be considered as the revolutions of human nature, often necessary, but always dangerous; necessary, when some favourite vice has

generally infected the world, or some error, long established, begins to tyrannize, to demand implicit faith, and refuse examination; but dangerous, lest the mind, incensed by oppression, heated by contest, and elated by victory, should be too far transported to attend to truth, and, out of zeal to secure her conquest, set up one error to depress another.

That no change in religion has been made with that calmness, caution and moderation which religion itself requires, and which common prudence shews to be necessary in the transaction of any important affair, every nation of the earth can sufficiently attest. Rage has been called in to the assistance of zeal, and destruction joined with reformation. Resolved not to stop short, men have generally gone too far, and, in lopping superfluities, have wounded essentials.

This conduct, when we consider the weakness of human nature, and the circumstances of most of those by whom such changes have been effected, is entitled at least to compassion, if not to excuse; nor can it be doubted that our great Creator looks down with tenderness and compassion upon the irregular starts and tempestuous agitations of a mind, moved by a zeal for his honour and a love of truth. Had all error and misconduct such a plea as this, they might indeed be lamented, and prayed against as weaknesses, but could hardly be censured, or condemned as crimes.

But more slow and silent transitions from one extreme to another are very frequent. Men, not impelled by the vehemence of opposition, but seduced by inclinations less violent, too often deviate from the paths of truth, and persuade others to follow them. The pride of singularity influences the teacher, and a love of novelty corrupts the follower, till the delusion, extending itself by degrees, becomes at length general, and overspreads a people.

The prevailing spirit of the present age seems to be the spirit of scepticism and captiousness, of suspicion and distrust, a contempt of all authority, and a presumptuous confidence in private judgment; a dislike of all established forms, mere-

ly because they are established, and of old paths, because they are old.

Into this temper have men been insensibly led by a warm assertion of the right of judging for themselves, a right not to be called in question, since God himself gave us a claim to it, in making us reasonable beings; and the apostle doubtless admits it when he directs us to give the reason of our faith to any that shall demand it.

But this privilege, ill understood, has been, and always may be, the occasion of very dangerous and pernicious mistakes; it may be exercised without knowledge or discretion, till error be entangled with error, till divisions be multiplied by endless subdivisions, till the bond of peace be entirely broken, and the church become a scene of confusion, a chaos of discordant forms of worship, and inconsistent systems of faith.

There are some men, we now find, to whom separation and disagreement appear not such formidable evils as they are generally represented; who can look, with the utmost calmness and unconcern, at a rising schism, and survey, without any perturbation, the speedy progress of an encreasing heresy. Let every man, say they, enjoy his opinions, since *he* only is answerable for them.

There are men, who for the most part value themselves, and are sometimes valued by others, for their enlarged views and generous sentiments; who pretend to look with uncommon penetration into the causes of human actions, and the secret motions of the mind; but perhaps this opinion is no proof that their pretensions are well grounded, or that they are better acquainted with human nature than those whom they affect to ridicule and insult.

If it be granted that it is the duty of every man to publish, profess and defend any important truth, and the truths of religion be allowed important, it will follow, that diversity of sentiments must naturally produce controversies and altercations. And how few there are capable of managing debates without unbecoming heat, or dishonest artifices, how soon

zeal is kindled into fury, and how soon a concern for reputation mingles with a concern for truth, how readily the antagonists deviate into personal invectives, and, instead of confuting the arguments, defame the lives of those whose doctrine they disapprove, and how often disputes terminate in uproar, riot and persecution, every one is convinced, and too many have experienced. That diversity of opinions, which is the original and source of such evils as these, cannot therefore be too diligently obviated; nor can too many endeavours be used to check the growth of new doctrines, and reclaim those that propagate them, before sects are formed, or schism established.

This is not to be done by denying or disputing the right of private judgment; but by exhorting all men to exercise it in a proper manner, according to each man's measure of knowledge, abilities and opportunities; and by endeavouring to remove all those difficulties which may obstruct the discovery of truth, and exposing the unreasonableness of such prejudices as may perplex or mislead the enquirer.

The prejudice to which many of the disorders of the present age, in which infidelity, superstition and enthusiasm seem contending for empire over us, may be justly ascribed, is an over-fondness for novelty, a desire of striking out new paths to peace and happiness, and a neglect of following the precept in the text, of asking for the old paths, where is the good way, and walking therein; a precept I shall therefore endeavour to illustrate,

First, by laying before you the dangers of judging of religion, without long and diligent examination.

Secondly, by evincing the reasonableness of searching into antiquity, or of asking for the old paths. And,

Thirdly, by shewing the happiness which attends a well-grounded belief, and steady practice of religion.

First, I propose to lay before you the dangers of judging of religion, without a long and diligent examination.

There is no topic more the favourite of the present age, than the innocence of error accompanied with sincerity. This doctrine has been cultivated with the utmost diligence, enforced with all the arts of argument, and embellished with all the ornaments of eloquence, but perhaps not bounded, with equal care, by proper limitations, nor preserved by just explication, from being a snare to pride, and a stumbling block to weakness.

That the judge of all the earth will do right, that he will require in proportion to what he has given, and punish men for the misapplication or neglect of talents, not for the want of them; that he condemns no man for not seeing what he has hid from him, or for not attending to what he could never hear, seems to be the necessary, the inevitable consequence of his own attributes.

That error therefore may be innocent will not be denied, because it undoubtedly may be sincere; but this concession will give very little countenance to the security and supineness, the coldness and indifference of the present generation, if we consider deliberately how much is required to constitute that sincerity, which shall avert the wrath of God, and reconcile him to error.

Sincerity is not barely a full persuasion of the truth of our assertions, a persuasion too often grounded upon a high opinion of our own sagacity, and confirmed perhaps by frequent triumphs over weak opponents, continually gaining new strength by a neglect of re-examination, which perhaps we decline, by industriously diverting our attention from any objections that arise in our thoughts, and suppressing any suspicion of a fallacy before the mind has time to connect its ideas, to form arguments, and draw conclusions. Sincerity is not a heat of the heart kept up by eager contentions or warm professions, nor a tranquillity produced by confidence and continued by indolence. There may be zeal without sincerity, and security without innocence. If we forbear to enquire through laziness or pride, or enquire with partiality, passion,

or precipitancy; if we do not watch over the most hidden motions of our hearts, and endeavour, with our utmost efforts, to banish all those secret tendencies and all those lurking inclinations which operate very frequently without being attended to, even by ourselves; if we do not carry on our search without regard to the reputation of our teachers, our followers, or ourselves, and labour after truth with equal industry and caution, let us not presume to put any trust in our sincerity.

Such is the present weakness and corruption of human nature, that sincerity, real sincerity, is rarely to be found; but till it be found, it is the last degree of folly to represent error as innocent. By a God infinitely merciful, and propitiated by the death of our blessed Saviour, it may indeed be pardoned, but it cannot be justified.

But the greatest part of those that declaim with most vehemence in defence of their darling notions, seem to have very little claim even to pardon on account of their sincerity. It is difficult to conceive what time is allotted to religious questions and controversies by a man whose life is engrossed by the hurries of business, and whose thoughts are continually upon the stretch, to form plans for the improvement of his fortune, or the gratification of his ambition. Nor is it very probable, that such subjects are more seriously considered by men abandoned to pleasure, men who sit down to eat, and rise up to play, whose life is a circle of successive amusements, and whose hours are distinguished only by vicissitudes of pleasure. And yet the questions which these frequently decide, and decide without the least suspicion of their own qualifications, are often of a very intricate and complicated kind, which must be disentangled by a long and continued attention, and resolved with many restrictions and great caution. Not only knowledge, judgment and experience, but uninterrupted leisure and retirement are necessary, that the chain of reasoning may be preserved unbroken, and the mind perform its operations without any hindrance from foreign objects.

To this end, men have formerly retreated to solitudes and cloisters, and excluded all the cares and pleasures of the world; and when they have spent a great part of their lives in study and meditation, at last, perhaps, deliver their opinions, as learned men will generally do, with diffidence and fear.

Happy would it be for the present age if men were now thus distrustful of their own abilities. They would not then adopt opinions merely because they wish them to be true, then defend what they have once adopted, warm themselves into confidence, and then rest satisfied with the pleasing consciousness of their own sincerity. We should not then see men, not eminent for any superior gifts of nature, or extraordinary attainments, endeavouring to form new sects, and to draw the *world after them*. They may indeed act with an honest intention, and so far with sincerity, but certainly without that caution which their experience ought to suggest, and that reverence for their superiors which reason, as well as the laws of society, requires. They seem, even when considered with the utmost candour, to have rather consulted their own imaginations, than to have asked for the old paths, where is the good way. It is therefore proper in this place that I should endeavour,

Secondly, to evince the reasonableness of searching into antiquity, or of asking for the *old paths*.

A contempt of the monuments and the wisdom of antiquity, may justly be reckoned one of the reigning follies of these days, to which pride and idleness have equally contributed. The study of antiquity is laborious; and to despise what we cannot, or will not understand, is a much more expeditious way to reputation. Part of the disesteem into which their writings are now fallen may indeed be ascribed to that exorbitant degree of veneration in which they were once held by blindness and superstition. But there is a mean betwixt idolatry and insult, between weak credulity and total disbelief. The ancients are not infallible, nor are their decisions to be received without examination; but they are at least the

determinations of men equally desirous with ourselves of discovering truth, and who had, in some cases, better opportunities than we now have.

With regard to the order and government of the Primitive Church, we may doubtless follow their authority with perfect security; they could not possibly be ignorant of laws executed, and customs practised by themselves; nor would they, even supposing them corrupt, serve any interests of their own, by handing down false accounts to posterity. We are therefore to enquire from them the different orders established in the ministry from the apostolic ages, the different employments of each, and their several ranks, subordinations and degrees of authority. From their writings we are to vindicate the establishment of our church; and by the same writings are those who differ from us, in these particulars, to defend their conduct.

Nor is this the only, though perhaps the chief use of these writers; for, in matters of faith, and points of doctrine, those, at least, who lived in the ages nearest to the times of the apostles undoubtedly deserve to be consulted. The oral doctrines and occasional explications of the apostles would not be immediately forgotten in the churches to which they had preached, and which had attended to them with the diligence and reverence which their mission and character demanded. Their solutions of difficulties and determinations of doubtful questions, must have been treasured up in the memory of their audiences, and transmitted, for some time, from father to son. Every thing, at least, that was declared by the inspired teachers to be necessary to salvation, must have been carefully recorded; and, therefore, what we find no traces of in the scripture, or the early fathers, as most of the peculiar tenets of the Romish Church, must certainly be concluded to be not necessary. Thus, by consulting first the holy scriptures, and next the writers of the primitive church, we shall make ourselves acquainted with the will of God; thus shall we discover the good way, and find that rest for our souls which

will amply recompense our studies and enquiries, as I shall attempt to prove,

Thirdly, by shewing the happiness which attends a well grounded belief and steady practice of religion.

The serenity and satisfaction, at which we arrive by a firm and settled persuasion of the fundamental articles of our religion, is very justly represented by the expression of finding rest for the soul. A mind, restless and undetermined, continually fluctuating betwixt various opinions, always in pursuit of some better scheme of duties and more eligible system of faith, eager to embrace every new doctrine, and adopt the notions of every pretender to extraordinary light, can never be sufficiently calm and unruffled to attend to those duties which procure that peace of God which passeth all understanding.

Suspense and uncertainty distract the soul, disturb its motions, and retard its operations; while we doubt in what manner to worship God, there is great danger lest we should neglect to worship him at all. A man, conscious of having long neglected to worship God, can scarcely place any confidence in his mercy; or hope, in the most pressing exigencies, for his protection. And how miserable is that man, who, on the bed of sickness, or in the hour of death, is without trust in the goodness of his Creator! This state, dreadful as it appears, may be justly apprehended by those who spend their lives in roving from one new way to another, and are so far from asking for the old paths, where is the good way, that when they are shewn it, they say, we will not walk therein.

There is a much closer connection between practice and speculation than is generally imagined. A man, disquieted with scruples concerning any important article of religion, will, for the most part, find himself indifferent and cold, even to those duties which he practised before with the most active diligence and ardent satisfaction. Let him then ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and he shall find rest for his soul. His mind, once set at ease from perplexity, and pet-

petual agitation, will return with more vigour to the exercises of piety. An uniform perseverance in these holy practices will produce a steady confidence in the divine favour, and that confidence will complete his happiness. To which that we may all attain, God of his infinite mercy grant, for the merits of Jesus Christ, our Saviour, to whom, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, be ascribed, as is most due, all honour, adoration and praise, now and ever! Amen.

SERMON VIII.

ROMANS xii. the latter part of the 16th verse.

Be not wise in your own conceits.

IT has been observed by those who have employed themselves in considering the methods of Providence, and the government of the world, that good and evil are distributed, through all states of life, if not in equal proportions, yet in such degrees as leave very little room for those murmurs and complaints which are frequently produced by superficial enquiries, negligent surveys, and impatient comparisons.

Every condition has, with regard to this life, its inconveniences, and every condition has likewise its advantages; though its position to the eye of the beholder may be so varied as that at some times the misery may be concealed, and at other times the happiness; but to judge only by the eye, is not the way to discover truth. We may pass by men without being able to distinguish whether they are to be numbered among those whose felicities, or whose sorrows preponderate; as we may walk over the ground without knowing whether its entrails contain mines of gold, or beds of sand.

Nor is it less certain that, with respect to the more important prospects of a future state, the same impartiality of distribution may be generally remarked; every condition of humanity, being exposed on one side, and guarded on the other, so that every man is burthened, though none are overwhelmed; every man is obliged to vigilance, but none are harassed beyond their strength. The great business therefore of every

man is to look diligently round him, that he may note the approaches of the enemy; and to bar the avenues of temptation, which the particular circumstances of his life are most likely to lay open; and to keep his heart in perpetual alarm against those sins which constantly besiege him. If he be rich, let him beware, lest when he is *full he deny God*, and say, *who is the Lord?* If he be poor, let him cautiously avoid *to steal*, and *take the name* of his *God in vain*.

There are some conditions of humanity which are made particularly dangerous by an uncommon degree of seeming security; conditions, in which we appear so completely fortified that we have little to dread, and therefore give ourselves up too readily to negligence and supineness; and are destroyed without precaution, because we flattered ourselves that destruction could not approach us. This fatal slumber of treacherous tranquillity may be produced and prolonged by many causes, by causes as various as the situations of *life*. Our condition may be such as may place us out of the reach of those general admonitions by which the rest of mankind are reminded of their errors and awakened to their duty; it may remove us to a great distance from the common incitements to common wickedness, and therefore may superinduce a forgetfulness of our natural frailties, and suppress all suspicions of the encroachments of sin—And the sin to which we are particularly tempted may be of that insidious and seductive kind, as that, without alarming us by the horrors of its appearance, and shocking us with the enormity of any single acts, may, by slow advances, possess the soul, and in destroying us differ only from the atrociousness of more apparent wickedness, as a lingering poison differs from the sword; more difficultly avoided, and more certainly fatal.

To temptations of this subtile, insinuating kind, the life of men of learning seems above all others to be exposed. As they are themselves appointed the teachers of others, they very rarely have the dangers of their own state set before them; as they are, by their abstraction and retirement, secluded from

the gaieties, the luxuries and the pageantries of life, they are willingly perſuaded to believe that, becauſe they are at a great diſtance from the rocks on which conſcience is moſt frequently wrecked, that therefore they ſail with ſafety, and may give themſelves to the wind without a compaſs. The crimes, from which they are in danger, are not thoſe from which the mind has been taught to ſhrink away with horror, or againſt which the invectives of moral or theological writers have generally been directed; and therefore they are ſuffered to approach unregarded, to gain ground imperceptibly upon minds directed to different views; and to fix themſelves at leiſure in the heart, where perhaps they are ſcarcely diſcovered till they are paſt eradication.

To theſe cauſes, or to ſome of theſe, it muſt ſurely be imputed, that learning is found ſo frequently to fail in the direction of life; and to operate ſo faintly and uncertainly in the regulation of *their* conduct, who are moſt celebrated for their application and proficiency. They have been betrayed, by ſome falſe ſecurity, to withhold their attention from their own lives; they have grown knowing, without growing virtuous; and have failed of the wiſdom which is the gift of the father of lights, becauſe they have thought it unneceſſary to ſeek it with that anxiety and importunity to which only it is granted; they have truſted to their own powers, and were *wiſe in their own conceits*.

There is perhaps no claſs of men, to whom the precept, given by the apoſtle to his converts againſt too great confidence in their underſtandings, may be more properly inculcated, than thoſe who are dedicated to the profeſſion of literature, and are therefore neceſſarily advanced to degrees of knowledge above them who are diſperſed among manual occupations, and the vulgar parts of life; whoſe attention is confined within the narrow limits of their own employments, and who have not often leiſure to think of more than the means of relieving their own wants, by ſupplying the demands of others.

With these, and such as these, placed sometimes, by whatever means, in much higher stations, a man of learning has such frequent opportunities of comparing himself; and is so strongly incited by that comparison, to indulge the contemplation of his own superiority, that it is not to be considered as wonderful, that vanity creeps in upon him; that he does not willingly withdraw his imagination from objects that so much flatter his passions, that he pursues the train of thought, from one reflection to another, places himself and others in every situation in which he can appear with advantage in his own eyes; rises to comparisons with still higher characters, and still retains the habit of giving himself the preference; and in all disputable cases turns the balance in his own favour, by superadding from his own conceit that wisdom which by nature he does not possess, or by industry he has not acquired.

This wisdom in his own conceit is very easily at first mistaken for qualities, not in themselves criminal, nor in themselves dangerous; nor is it easy to fix the limits, in speculation, between a resolute adherence to that which appears truth, and an obstinate obtrusion of peculiar notions upon the understanding of others; between the pleasure that naturally arises from the enlargement of the mind and increase of knowledge, and that which proceeds from a contempt of others, and the insolent triumphs of intellectual superiority. Yet though the confines of these qualities are nearly alike, their extremes are widely different; and it will soon be discovered, how much evil is avoided by repressing that opinion of ourselves which vanity suggests, and that confidence which is gained only *by measuring ourselves by ourselves*, dwelling on our own excellence, and flattering ourselves with secret panegyrics.

As this false claim to wisdom is the source of many faults as well as miseries to men of learning, it seems of the utmost importance to obviate it in the young, who may be imagined to be very little tainted, and suppress it in others, whose greater advances and more extensive reputation have more endan-

gered them; nor can any man think himself so innocent of this fault, or so secure from it, as that it should be unnecessary for him to consider,

First, The dangers which men of learning incur, by being wise in their own conceits.

Secondly, The proper means by which that pernicious conceit of wisdom may be avoided or suppressed.

In order to state with more accuracy the dangers which men, dedicated to learning, may be reasonably imagined to incur, by being wise in their own conceits, it is necessary to distinguish the different periods of their lives, and to examine whether this disposition is not in its tendency equally opposite to our duty, and, by inevitable consequences in its effects, equally destructive of our happiness in every state.

The business of the life of a scholar is to accumulate and to diffuse knowledge; to learn, in order that he may teach. The first part of his time is assigned to study and the acquisition of learning; the latter, to the practice of those arts which he has acquired, and to the instruction of others who have had less time, or opportunities, or abilities, for improvement. In the state therefore of a learner, or of a teacher, the man of letters is always to be considered; and if it shall appear that, on whatever part of his task he is employed, a false opinion of his own excellence will naturally and certainly defeat his endeavours; it may be hoped, that there will be found sufficient reason, why no man should *be wise in his own conceit.*

Since no man can teach what he has never learned, the value and usefulness of the latter part of his life must depend in a great measure upon the proper application of the earlier years; and he that neglects the improvement of his own mind, will never be enabled to instruct others. Light must strike on the body, by which light can be reflected. The disposition, therefore, which best befits a young man, about to engage in a life of study, is patience in enquiry; eagerness of knowledge; and willingness to be instructed; a due submission to greater abilities and longer experience; and a ready

obedience to those, from whom he is to expect the removal of his ignorance, and the resolution of his doubts.

How unlikely any one, wise in his own conceit, is to excite, or promote in himself such inclinations, may be easily determined. It is well known that study is not diligently prosecuted, but at the expense of many pleasures and amusements; which no young man will be persuaded to forbear, but upon the most cogent motives, and the strongest conviction. He that is to draw truth from the depths of obscurity, must be fully informed of its value, and the necessity of finding it; he that engages in a state, opposite to the pleasures of sense, and the gratification of every higher passion, must have some principle within, strongly implanted, which may enforce industry, and repel temptation. But how shall he, who is already *wise in his own conceit*, submit to such tedious and laborious methods of instruction? Why should he toil for that which, in his own opinion, he possesses; and drudge for the supply of wants which he does not feel? He has already such degrees of knowledge as, magnified by his own imagination, exalt him above the rest of mankind; and to climb higher, would be to labour without advantage.

He already has a wide extent of science within his view, and his willingness to be pleased with himself does not suffer him to think, or to dwell on the thought of any thing beyond; and who that sees all, would wish to see farther? That submission to authority, and that reverence for instruction, which so well becomes every man at his first entrance upon new regions of learning, where all is novelty, confusion and darkness, and no way is to be found through the intricacies, of opposite systems, but by tracing the steps of those that have gone before; that willingness to receive implicitly what farther advances only can enable him to prove, which instruction always supposes; are very little to be expected from him, who looks down with scorn upon his teacher, and is more ready to censure the obscurity of precepts, than to suspect the force of his own understanding. "Knowledge is to be attained by slow

and gradual acquisitions, by a careful review of our ideas, and a regular superstructure of one proposition on another; and is therefore the reward only of diligence and patience. But patience is the effect of modesty; pride grasps at the whole, and what it cannot hold, it affects to despise; it is rather solicitous to display, than increase its acquisitions; and rather endeavours, by fame, to supply the want of knowledge, than by knowledge to arrive at fame.

That these are not imaginary representations, but true copies of real life, most of those to whom the instruction of young men is intrusted, will be ready to confess; since they have often the dissatisfaction of finding that, in proportion as greater advances have been made in the first period of life, there is less diligence in the second. And that, as it was said of the ancient Gauls, they were more than men in the onset, and less than women in the shock; it may be said in our literary contentions, that many who were men at school, are boys at college.

Their ardour remits, their diligence relaxes; and they give themselves to a lazy contemplation of comparative excellence, without considering that the comparison is hourly growing less advantageous, and that the acquisitions which they boast are mouldering away.

Such is the danger to a learner, of too early an opinion of his own importance; but if we suppose him to have escaped in his first years this fatal confidence, and to be betrayed into it by a longer series of successful application, its effects will then be equally dangerous; and as it hinders a young man from receiving instruction, it will obstruct an older student from conveying it.

There is no employment in which men are more easily betrayed to indecency and impatience, than in that of teaching; in which they necessarily converse with those who are their inferiors in the relation by which they are connected, and whom it may be sometimes proper to treat with that dig-

nity which too often swells into arrogance; and to restrain with such authority as not every man has learned to separate from tyranny. In this state of temporary honour, a proud man is too willing to exert his prerogative; and too ready to forget that he is dictating to those who may one day dictate to him. He is inclined to wonder that what he comprehends himself is not equally clear to others; and often reproaches the intellects of his auditors, when he ought to blame the confusion of his own ideas, and the improprieties of his own language. He reiterates therefore his positions without elucidation, and enforces his assertion by his frown, when he finds arguments less easy to be supplied. Thus, forgetting that he had to do with men whose passions are perhaps equally turbulent with his own, he transfers by degrees to his instruction the prejudices which are first raised by his behaviour; and having forced upon his pupils an hatred of their teacher, he sees it quickly terminate in a contempt of the precept.

But instruction extends farther than to seminaries of students, or the narrow auditories of sequestered literature. The end of learning is to teach the public, to superintend the conduct, watch over the morals, and regulate the opinions of parishes, dioceses and provinces, to check vices in their first eruption, and suppress heresies in the whispers of their rise. And surely this awful, this arduous task, requires qualities which a man, *wise in his own conceit*, cannot easily attain; that mildness of address, that patience of attention, that calmness of disputation, that selection of times, and places, and circumstances which the vehemence of pride will not regard. And, in reality, it will generally be found, that the first objection and the last to an unacceptable pastor is, that he is proud, that he is too wise for familiarity, and will not descend to the level with common understandings.

Such is the consequence of too high an esteem of our own powers and knowledge; it makes us in youth negligent, and in age useless; it teaches us too soon to be satisfied with our attainments; or it makes our attainments unpleasing, unpop-

ular and ineffectual; it neither suffers us to learn nor to teach, but withholds us from those by whom we might be instructed, and drives those from us whom we might instruct. It is therefore necessary to obviate these evils, by enquiring,

Secondly, By what means this pernicious conceit of wisdom may be avoided or suppressed.

It might be imagined, if daily experience did not shew us how vainly judgments are formed of real life from speculative principles, that it might be easy for any man to extirpate a high conceit of human learning from his own heart, or that of another; since one great purpose of knowledge is to shew us our own defects, follies and miseries; yet, whatever be the reason, we find none more subject to this fault than those whose course of life ought more particularly to exempt them from it.

For the suppression of this vain conceit, so injurious to the professors of learning, many considerations might be added to those which have already been drawn from its effects. The reasons, indeed, why every man should be humble, are inseparably connected with human nature; for what can any man see, either within or without himself that does not afford him some reason to remark his own ignorance, imbecility and meanness?

But on these reflections it is less proper to insist, because they have been explained already by almost every writer upon moral and religious duties, and because, in reality, the pride which requires our chief caution is not so much absolute as comparative. No man so much values himself upon the general prerogatives of human nature, as upon his own peculiar superiority to other men; nor will he therefore be humbled by being told of the ignorance, the weakness and wickedness of humanity; for he is satisfied with being accounted one of the most knowing among the ignorant; the most able among the weak, and the most virtuous among the wicked.

The pride of the learned, therefore, can only be repressed by shewing, what indeed might easily be shewn, that it is not justifiable, even upon comparison with the rest of men; for, without urging any thing in derogation from the dignity and importance of learning in general, which must always, either immediately, or by the intervention of others, govern the world, it will be found that they who are most disposed to be swelled to haughtiness by their own attainments, are generally so far from having any just claim to the superiority which they exert that they are betrayed to vanity by ignorance; and are pleased with themselves, as a hind with his cottage, not because, upon enquiry, they are convinced of the reasonableness of the preference, but because they overvalue the little they possess for want of knowing its littleness; and are contented with their own state, as a blind man feels no loss from the absence of beauty. Nor needs there any other proof of the origin of literary pride, than that it is chiefly to be found amongst those who have secluded themselves from the world, in pursuit of petty enquiries and trivial studies.

To such men it should be recommended that, before they suffer themselves to fix the rule of their own accomplishments and look down on others with contempt, they should enjoin themselves to spend some time in enquiring into their own pretensions; and consider who they are whom they despise, and for what reason they suffer themselves to indulge the arrogance of contempt. Such an examination will soon drive back the pedant to his college, with juster conceptions and with humbler sentiments; for he will find that those, whom he imagined so much below his own exaltation, often flourish in the esteem of the world, while he himself is unknown; and teaching those arts by which society is supported, and on which the happiness of the world depends; while he is pleasing himself with idle amusements, and wasting his life upon questions of which very few desire the solution.

But if this method of obtaining humility be ineffectual, he may, however, establish it upon more strong and lasting prin-

ciples, by applying himself to the duties of religion and the word of God. That sacred and inscrutable word, which will shew him the inefficacy of all other knowledge, and those duties which will imprint upon his mind, that he best understands the sacred writings who most carefully obeys them. Thus will humility fix a firm and lasting basis, by annihilation of all empty distinctions and petty competitions, by shewing that *one thing only is necessary*, and that *God is all in all*.

SERMON IX.

1 CORINTHIANS, CHAP. xi. VER. 28.

But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.

NOTHING is more frequently injurious to religion, or more dangerous to mankind, than the practice of adding to the divine institutions, and of teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. The doctrines of the blessed sacrament, which, as they are expressed in the holy scriptures, do not seem to be very dark or difficult, yet have been so perverted and misrepresented, as to occasion many disputes among men of learning, and many divisions in the christian world. In our own church, many religious minds have been filled with groundless apprehensions, and distracted with unnecessary disquietudes, by mistaken notions of the Lord's supper. Many have forborne to partake of it, because they have not, in their own opinion, arrived to that degree of holiness required to it; which they erroneously conceive to be such as indeed no mere man ever can attain; a holiness, which consists in little less than a complete exemption from sin, and an uniform and uninterrupted observance of every precept of religion. They find themselves unable to perform this duty without imperfections, and therefore they entirely neglect it; not considering that the same reason is of equal force for the neglect of every duty; since none can be performed by us, in this frail state, without lapses, negligences and failings; and that God will accept unfeigned repentance, sincere intentions and earnest endeavours, though entangled with many frailties. They

do not consider, that the participation of the sacrament is a duty enjoined upon all christians, though all do not rise to equal degrees of virtue; and, by consequence, that many must be admitted to the holy table who have not reached the utmost heights of religious excellence. Heaven itself will be accessible to many, who died in their struggles with sin, in their endeavours after virtue, and the beginning of a new life. And surely, they are not to be excluded from commemorating the sufferings of our Saviour, in a christian congregation, who would not be shut from heaven, from the assemblies of saints and the choirs of angels.

There are some who neglect this duty, as they omit others, not from scruples of melancholy piety, or mistaken severity, but from supineness and carelessness, or an opinion that this precept is less necessary to be observed than some others delivered by the same authority.

Many other notions, not well grounded, or capable of proof, are entertained of this institution; which I shall endeavour, without giving a particular account of them, to obviate and suppress, by shewing,

First, What is the nature and end of this institution according to the scriptures.

Secondly, What are the obligations which enforce the duty of communion. And,

Thirdly, What things are required of them that come to the Lord's supper.

First, I propose to lay before you the nature and end of this institution according to the scriptures.

The account of the first institution of this sacrament is thus delivered by the evangelist, (Luke, chap. xxii. ver. 19.) And he took bread and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it unto them, saying, *This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.* Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, *This cup is the new testament in my blood which is shed for you.* This narration is repeated in the epistle to the Corinthians, with this comment or explanation; *As often as*

ye eat this bread, or drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come. From these passages compared, then, it appears, that this sacrament is a representation of the death of our Saviour, appointed by himself, to be celebrated by all his followers, in all ages; to the end that, by commemorating his sufferings in a solemn and public manner, they might declare their confidence in his merits, their belief of his mission, and their adherence to his religion.

It has likewise a tendency to increase this confidence, confirm this belief, and establish this adherence, not only by the new strength which every idea acquires by a new impression, and which every persuasion attains by new recollection, approbation and meditation, but likewise by the supernatural and extraordinary influences of grace, and those blessings which God has annexed to the due use of means appointed by himself.

By commemorating the death of Christ, as the redeemer of the world, we confess our belief in him; for why else should we perform so solemn a rite in commemoration of him? To confess our belief in him, is to declare ourselves his followers. We enter into an obligation to perform those conditions upon which he has admitted us to follow him, and to practise all the duties of that religion which he has taught us.

This is implied in the word sacrament, which, being originally used to signify an oath of fidelity taken by the soldiers to their leaders, is now made use of by the church, to import a solemn vow of unshaken adherence to the faith of Christ.

Thus the sacrament is a kind of repetition of baptism, the means whereby we are readmitted into the communion of the church of Christ, when we have, by sin, been separated from it; for every sin, and much more any habit or course of sin long continued, is, according to the different degrees of guilt, an apostacy or defection from our Saviour; as it is a breach of those conditions upon which we became his followers; and he that breaks the condition of a covenant, dissolves it on his side. Having therefore broken the covenant between us

and our Redeemer, we lose the benefits of his death; nor can we have any hopes of obtaining them, while we remain in this state of separation from him.

But vain had been the sufferings of our Saviour, had there not been left means of reconciliation to him; since every man falls away from him occasionally by sins of negligence at least, and perhaps by known, deliberate, premeditated offences. So that some method of renewing the covenant between God and man was necessary; and for this purpose this sacrament was instituted; which is therefore a renewal of our broken vows, a re-entrance into the society of the church, and the act by which we are restored to the benefits of our Saviour's death, upon performance of the terms prescribed by him.

So that this sacrament is a solemn ratification of a covenant renewed; by which, after having alienated ourselves from Christ by sin, we are restored, upon our repentance and reformation, to pardon and favour, and the certain hopes of everlasting life.

When we thus enter upon a new life by a solemn, deliberate, and serious dedication of ourselves to more exact and vigilant service of God, and oblige ourselves to the duties of piety by this sacrament, we may hope to obtain, by fervent and humble prayer, such assistances from God as may enable us to perform those engagements, which we have entered into by his command, and in the manner appointed by him; always remembering that we must use our own endeavours, and exert our utmost natural powers, for God only co-operates with the diligent and the watchful. We must avoid sin, by avoiding those occasions which betray us to it, and, as we pray that we may not be led, we must be cautious of leading ourselves into temptation.

All sin that is committed by Christians is committed either through an absolute forgetfulness of God, for the time in which the inordinate passion, of whatever kind it be, predominates and prevails; or because, if the ideas of God and re-

ligion were present to our minds, they were not strong enough to overcome and suppress the desires excited by some pleasing, or the apprehensions raised by some terrible, object. So that either the love or fear of temporal good or evil were more powerful than the love or fear of God.

All ideas influence our conduct with more or less force, as they are more or less strongly impressed upon the mind; and they are impressed more strongly, as they are more frequently recollected or renewed. For every idea, whether of love, fear, grief, or any other passion, loses its force by time; and, unless revived by accident, or voluntary meditation, will at last vanish. But by dwelling upon, and indulging any idea, we may increase its efficacy and force, make it by degrees predominant in the soul, and raise it to an ascendant over our passions, so that it shall easily over-rule those affections or appetites which formerly tyrannized within us.

Thus, by a neglect of God's worship and sacraments, a man may lose almost all distinction whatsoever of good and evil, and, having no awe of the divine power to oppose his inclinations to wickedness, may go forward from crime to crime without remorse. And he that struggles against vice, and is often overcome by powerful temptations, if, instead of giving way to idleness and despair, he continues his resistance; and, by a diligent attendance upon the service and sacraments of church, together with a regular practice of private devotion, endeavours to strengthen his faith, and imprint upon himself an habitual attention to the laws of God, and a constant sense of his presence; he will soon find himself able to avoid the snares of sin, or, if he fall into them by inadvertency, to break them. He will find the fear of God grow superior to the desires of wealth, or the love of pleasure; and, by persisting to frequent the church and sacraments, and thereby to preserve those notions of piety from being effaced or weakened, he will be able to persevere in a steady practice of virtue, and enjoy the unspeakable pleasures of a quiet conscience.

Thus it appears, that the blessed sacrament is a commemo-

ration of the death of our Lord; consequently, a declaration of our faith; and both naturally, and by the co-operation of God, the means of increasing that faith. And it appears also that it is a renewal of our baptismal vow, after we have broken it by sin; and a renovation of that covenant by which we are adopted the followers of Jesus, and made partakers of his merits, and the benefits of his death.

This account has almost anticipated what I professed to treat of.

Secondly, the obligations which enforce the duty of communion.

For the obligations to any duty must bear proportion to the importance of it; and the importance of a duty must be rated by the effect which it produces or promotes; and therefore, as the benefits which we receive from this sacrament have been already shewn, the necessity of it is sufficiently apparent.

But we may farther enforce this practice upon ourselves and others, by considering, first, that it is a positive injunction of our blessed Saviour, which, therefore, all those who believe in him are bound to obey. That to dispute the usefulness, or call in question the necessity of it, is to reform his religion, and to set up our own wisdom in opposition to his commands; and that to refuse the means of grace, is to place our confidence in our own strength, and to neglect the assistance of that comforter, who came down from Heaven according to the most true promise of our blessed Saviour, to lead the apostles out of darkness and error, and to guide them and us into the clear light and certain knowledge of God, and of his son Jesus Christ.

If we consider this sacrament as a renewal of the vow of baptism, and the means of reconciling us to God, and restoring us to a participation of the merits of our Saviour, which we had forfeited by sin, we shall need no persuasions to a frequent communion. For certainly nothing can be more dreadful than to live under the displeasure of God, in con-

ſiant danger of appearing before him, while he is yet unappeaſed, and of loſing the benefits of our redemption. Whoever he be, whom ſin has deluded and led away, let him not delay to return to his duty, leſt ſome ſudden diſeaſe ſeize upon him, and the hand of death cut him off for ever from any poſſibility of reformation, while he is indolent and voluptuous, irreligious and profane. It will be too late to bewail his ſupineneſs, and lament his folly, when the *dreadful and irrevocable* ſentence is paſt, and the gates of hell are cloſed upon him. "Seek, ye the Lord while he may be found; call ye upon him while he is near! Let the wicked forſake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon."

But leſt, inſtead of obtaining pardon, we aggravate our ſins, by coming unprepared to the holy table, let us *conſider*,

Thirdly, What is required of them that come to the Lord's ſupper.

With reſpect to the preparatory duties requiſite to a worthy reception of the ſacrament, St. Paul has left this precept; "Let a man examine himſelf, and ſo let him eat of that bread." Which will be eaſily explained, by recurring to what has been already ſaid of the nature of the ſacrament.

By partaking of the communion, we declare, in the moſt ſolemn manner, in the preſence of God and man, that we hold the faith of Jeſus; that we are his followers, who expect eternal ſalvation from his merits; and, therefore, that we engage ourſelves to that obedience to his commands, and that ſtrictneſs and regularity of life, which he requires from thoſe who place their confidence in his mediation. We profeſs, likewiſe, that we ſincerely and humbly repent of thoſe offences by which we have ſeparated ourſelves from him; and that, in conſequence of this profeſſion, we unite ourſelves again to the communion of the church.

Nothing can be more reaſonable, before this ſolemn profeſſion, than that a man examine himſelf, whether it be true;

whether he really and unfeignedly resolves to accept the conditions of salvation offered to him, and to perform his part of the covenant which he comes to ratify; or, whether he is not about to mock God; to profess a faith which he does not hold, and a purity which he does not intend to aim at.

"The terms upon which we are to hope for any benefits from the merits of Christ, are faith, repentance, and subsequent obedience. These are therefore the three chief and general heads of examination. We cannot receive the sacrament unless we believe in Christ, because by receiving it we declare our belief in him, and a lying tongue is an abomination to the Lord. We cannot receive it without repentance, because repentance is the means by which, after sin, we are reconciled to God; and we cannot, without dreadful wickedness, by partaking of the outward tokens of reconciliation, declare that we believe God at peace with our souls, when we know that, by the omission of repentance, we are yet in a state of voluntary alienation from him. We cannot receive it without a sincere intention of obedience; because, by declaring ourselves his followers, we enter into obligations to obey his commandments. We are therefore not transiently and carelessly, but frequently and seriously to ask ourselves, whether we firmly believe the promises of our Saviour; whether we repent of our sins, and resolve, for the future, to avoid all those things which God has forbidden, and practise all those which he has commanded. And when any man is convinced that he has formed real resolutions of a new life, let him pray for strength and constancy to persevere in them, and then let him come joyfully to the holy table, in sure confidence of pardon, reconciliation and life everlasting.

Which that we may all obtain, God of his infinite mercy grant, for the merits of Jesus Christ, our Saviour; to whom, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, three Persons and one God, be ascribed all honour, adoration and praise, now and forever! Amen.

SERMON X.

GALATIANS, CHAP. vi. VER. 7.

Be not deceived, God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he reap.

ONE of the mighty blessings bestowed upon us by the christian revolution is, that we have now a certain knowledge of a future state, and of the rewards and punishments that await us after death, and will be adjusted according to our conduct in this world. We, on whom the light of the gospel shines, walk no longer in darkness, doubtful of the benefit of *good*, or the danger of *bad* actions; we know that we live and act under the eye of our Father and our Judge, by whom nothing is overlooked or forgotten, and who, though to try our obedience he suffers, in the present state of things, the same events to happen to the good and to the evil, will at last certainly distinguish them, by allotting them different conditions beyond the grave; when it will appear, in the sight of men and of angels, how amiable is godliness, and how odious is sin, by the final sentence which shall bring upon man the consequences of his own actions, so as that *whatsoever a man shall sow, that shall he reap.*

The ancient heathens, with whose notions we are acquainted, how far soever they might have carried their speculations of moral or civil wisdom, had no conception of a future state, except idle fictions, which those who considered them treated as ridiculous, or dark conjectures, formed by men of deep thoughts and great enquiry, but neither, in themselves, capable of compelling conviction, nor brought at all to the knowl-

edge of the gross of mankind, of those who lived in pleasure and idleness, or in solitude and labour; they were confined to the closet of the student, or the school of the lecturer, and were very little diffused among the busy or the vulgar.

There is no reason to wonder that many enormities should prevail, where there was nothing to oppose them. When we consider the various and perpetual temptations of appetite within, and interest without; when we see that on every side there is something that solicits the desires, and which cannot be innocently obtained; what can we then expect but that, notwithstanding all the securities of law and all the vigilance of magistrates, those that know of no other world will eagerly make the most of this, and please themselves whenever they can, with very little regard to the right of others?

As the state of the heathens was a state of darkness, it must have been a state likewise of disorder; a state of perpetual contest for the goods of this life, and by consequence of perpetual danger to those who *abounded*, and of temptation to those that were in *want*.

The Jews enjoyed a very ample communication of the divine will, and had a religion which an inspired legislator had prescribed. But even to this nation, the only nation free from idolatry, and acquainted with the perfections of the *true* God, was the doctrine of a future state so obscurely revealed, that it was not *necessarily* consequential to the reception, or observation of their *practical* religion. The Sadducees, who *acknowledged* the authority of the Mosaical law, yet *denied* the separate existence of the soul, had no expectation of a future state. They held that there was no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit.

This was not in those times the *general* state of the Jewish nation; the Pharisees held the resurrection, and with them probably for the greater part of the people; but that any man could be a Jew, and yet deny a future state, is a sufficient proof that it had not yet been *clearly revealed*. and that it was reserved for the preachers of christianity to bring life and im-

mortality to light: In such a degree of light they are now placed, that they can be denied or doubted no longer, but as the *gospel*, that shews them, is doubted or denied. It is now certain that we are *here* not in our *total* nor in our *ultimate existence*, but in a state of exercise and probation, commanded to qualify ourselves, by pure hearts and virtuous actions, for the enjoyment of future felicity in the presence of God; and prohibited to break the laws which his wisdom has given us, under the penal sanction of banishment from *heaven* into *regions of misery*.

Yet notwithstanding the express declaration of our Saviour, and the constant reference of our actions and duties to a future state, throughout the whole volume of the new testament; there are yet, as in the apostles' time, men who are deceived, who act as if they thought God would be mocked or deluded, and who appear to forget that *whatsoever a man sows, that shall he reap*.

From this important caution, given by the apostle immediately to those whom he was then directing, and consequently to all professors of the religion of Christ, occasion may be taken to consider,

First, How sinners *are deceived*.

Secondly, How certain it is that *God is not mocked*.

Thirdly, In what sense it is to be understood, that whatsoever a man sows, that shall he reap.

In examining, first, how sinners are deceived, it will immediately occur to us that no man is deceived to his damnation but by the devil himself. The subtilties of the devil are undoubtedly many; he has probably the power of presenting opportunities of sin, and at the same time of inflaming the passions, of suggesting evil desires, and interrupting holy meditations; but his power is so limited by the governor of the universe that he cannot hurt us without our own consent; his power is but like that of a wicked companion, who may solicit us to crimes or follies, but with whom we feel no necessity of complying; he therefore that yields to temptation,

has the greater part in his own destruction; he has been warned of his danger, he has been taught his duty; and, if these warnings and instructions have had no effect, he may be said voluntarily to desert the right way, and not so much to be deceived by another, as to deceive himself.

Of self-conceit, in the great business of our lives, there are various modes. The far greater part of mankind deceive themselves by willing negligence, by refusing to think on their real state, lest such thoughts should trouble their quiet, or interrupt their pursuits. To live religiously, is to walk not by sight, but by faith; to act in confidence of things unseen, in hope of future recompense, and fear of future punishment. To abstract the thoughts from things spiritual is not difficult; things future do not obtrude themselves upon the senses, and therefore easily give way to external objects. He that is willing to forget religion, may quickly lose it; and that most men are willing to forget it experience informs us. If we look into the gay, or the busy world, we see every eye directed towards pleasure or advantage, and every hour filled with expectation or occupied by employment, and day passed after day in the enjoyment of success, or the vexation of disappointment.

Nor is it true only of men, who are engaged in enterprizes of hazard, which restrain the faculties to the utmost, and keep attention always upon the stretch. Religion is not only neglected by the projector and adventurer, by men who suspend their happiness on the slender thread of artifice, or stand tottering upon the point of chance. For, if we visit the most cool, and regular parts of the community, if we turn our eye to the farm, or to the shop, where one year glides uniformly after another, and nothing new or important is either expected or dreaded; yet still the same indifference about eternity will be found. There is no interest so small, nor engagement so slight, but that, if it be followed and expanded, it may be sufficient to keep religion out of the thoughts. Many men

may be obſerved, not agitated by very violent paſſions, nor overborne by any powerful habits, nor depraved by any great degrees of wickedneſs; men who are honeſt dealers, faithful friends, and inoffenſive neighbours, who yet have no vital principle of Religion; who live wholly without ſelf-examination; and indulge any deſire that happens to ariſe, with very little reſiſtance, or compunction; who hardly know what it is to combat a temptation, or to repent of a fault; but go on, neither ſelf-approved, nor ſelf-condemned; not endeavouring after any excellence, nor reforming any vicious practice, or irregular deſire. They have no care of futurity, neither is God in all their thoughts; they direct none of their actions to his glory, they do nothing with the hope of pleaſing, they avoid nothing for the fear of offending him. Thoſe men want not much of being religious, they have nothing more than caſual views to reform, and, from being peaceable and temperate heathens, might, if they would once awaken to their eternal intereſt, become pious and exemplary Chriſtians. But let them not be deceived, they cannot ſuppoſe that God will accept him, who never wiſhed to be accepted by him, or made his will the rule of action.

Others there are, who, without attending to the written revelation of God's will, form to themſelves a ſcheme of conduct, in which vice is mingled with virtue, and who cover from themſelves, and hope to cover from God, the indulgence of ſome criminal deſire, or the continuance of ſome vicious habit, by a few ſplendid inſtances of public ſpirit, or ſome few effuſions of occaſional bounty. But to theſe men it may, with emphatical propriety, be urged, that God is not mocked; he will not be worſhipped nor obeyed, but according to his own laws.

The mode of ſelf-deception which prevails moſt in the world, and by which the greateſt number of ſouls is at leaſt betrayed to deſtruction, is the art, which we are all too apt to practiſe, of putting far from us the evil day, of ſetting the hour of death, and the day of account, at a great diſtance.

That death is certain every one knows: nor is it less known, that life is destroyed at all ages by a thousand causes; that the strong and the vigorous are liable to diseases, and that caution and temperance afford no security against the final stroke. Yet as the thought of dissolution is dreadful, we do not willingly admit it; the desire of life is connected with animation; every living being shrinks from his destruction; to wish, and to hope, are never far asunder; as we wish for long life, we hope that our wishes will be granted, and what we hope we either believe, or do not examine. So tenaciously does our credulity lay hold of life, that it is rare to find any man so old, as not to expect an addition to his years, or so far wasted and enfeebled with disease, as not to flatter himself with hopes of recovery.

To those, who procrastinate amendment, in hopes of better opportunities in future time, it is too often vainly urged by the preacher, and vainly suggested by a thousand examples, that the hour of death is uncertain. This, which ought to be the cause of their terror, is the ground of their hope; that, as death is uncertain, it may be distant. This uncertainty is, in effect, the great support of the whole system of life. The man who died yesterday had purchased an estate, to which he intended some time to retire; or built a house, which he was hereafter to inhabit; and planted gardens and groves, that, in a certain number of years, were to supply delicacies to his feasts, and shades to his meditations. He is snatched away, and has left his designs and his labours to others.

As men please themselves with felicities to be enjoyed in the days of leisure and retreat; so among these felicities, it is not uncommon to design a reformation of life, and a course of piety. Among the more enlightened and judicious part of mankind, there are many who live in a continual disapprobation of their own conduct, who know that they do every day what they ought to leave undone, and every day leave undone what they ought to do; and who therefore consider themselves as living under the divine displeasure, in a state in

which it would be very dangerous to die. Such men anſwer the reproaches of conſcience with promiſes of amendment, promiſes made with ſincerity and intention of performance, but which they conſider as debts to be diſcharged at ſome remote time. They neither ſin with ſtupid negligence, nor with impious defiance of the divine laws; they fear the puniſhments denounced againſt ſin, but pacify their anxiety with poſſibilities of repentance, and with a plan of *life to be led* according to the ſtrict precepts of religion, and to be cloſed at laſt by a death ſoftened by holy conſolations. Projects of future piety are perhaps not leſs common than of future pleaſure, and are, as there is reaſon to fear, not leſs commonly interrupted; with this dreadful difference, that he who miſſes his intended pleaſure, eſcapes a diſappointment, but he who is cut off before the ſeaſon of repentance, is expoſed to the vengeance of an angry God.

Whoever has been deluded by this infatuation, and has hitherto neglected thoſe duties which he intends ſome time to perform, is admoniſhed, by all the principles of prudence, and all the courſe of nature, to conſider how much he ventures, and with how little probability in his favour. The continuance of life, though, like all other things adjuſted by Providence, may be properly conſidered by us caſual; and wiſdom always directs us, not to leave that to chance which may be made certain, and not to venture any thing upon chance which it will much hurt us to loſe.

He who, accuſed by his conſcience of habitual diſobedience, defers his reformation, apparently leaves his ſoul in the power of chance. We are in full poſſeſſion of the *preſent* moment; let the *preſent* moment be improved; let that, which muſt neceſſarily be done ſome time, be no longer neglected. Let us remember that, if our lot ſhould fall otherwiſe than we ſuppoſe; if we are of the number of them, to whom length of life is not granted; we loſe, what can never be recovered, and what will never be recompenſed, the mercy of God and the joys of futurity.

That long life is not commonly granted, is sufficiently apparent; for life is called long, not as being, at its greatest length, of much duration, but as being longer than common. Since, therefore, the common condition of man is not to live long, we have no reason to conclude, that what happens to few will happen to us.

But to abate our confidence in our own resolutions, it is to be remembered, that though we should arrive at the great year destined for the change of life, it is by no means certain that we shall effect what we have purposed. Age is buckled with infirmity and diseases. Immediate pain and present vexation will then do what amusement and gaiety did before, will enchain the attention and occupy the thoughts, and leave little vacancy for the past or future. Whoever suffers great pain has no other care than to obtain ease; and, if ease is for a time obtained, he values it too much to lessen it by painful reflections.

Neither is an efficacious repentance so easy a work, as that we may be sure of performing it at the time appointed by ourselves. The longer habits have been indulged, the more imperious they become; it is not by bidding them to be gone, that we can at once dismiss them; they may be suppressed and lie dormant for a time, and resume their force at an unexpected moment, by some sudden temptation; they can be subdued only by continued caution and repeated conflicts.

The longer sin has been indulged, the more irksome will be the retrospect of life. So much uneasiness will be suffered, at the review of years spent in vicious enjoyment, that there is reason to fear, lest that delay, which began in the love of pleasure, will be continued for fear of pain.

Neither is it certain that the grace, without which no man can correct his own corruption, when it has been offered and refused, will be offered again; or that he who stopped his ears against the first call, will be vouchsafed a second. He

cannot expect to be received among the servants of God, who will obey him only at his own time; for such presumption is, in some degree, a mockery of God, and we are to consider, secondly, how certain it is, that God is not mocked.

God is not mocked in any sense. He will not be mocked with counterfeit piety, he will not be mocked with idle resolutions; but the sense in which the text declares that God is not mocked, seems to be, that God will not suffer his decrees to be invalidated; he will not leave his promises unfulfilled, nor his threats unexecuted. And this will easily appear, if we consider, that promises and threats can only become ineffectual by change of mind, or want of power. God cannot change his will, *he is not a man that he should repent*: what he has spoken will surely come to pass. Neither can he want power to execute his purposes; he who spoke, and the world was made, can speak again, and it will perish. God's *arm is not shortened that he cannot save*: neither is it shortened, that he cannot punish; and that he will do to every man according to his works will be shewn, when we have considered,

Thirdly, In what sense it is to be understood, that whatsoever a man sows, that shall he reap.

To sow and to reap are figurative terms. To sow signifies to act; and to reap, is to receive the product of our actions. As no man can sow one sort of grain, and reap another, in the ordinary process of nature; as no man gathers grapes of thorns or figs of thistles, or, when he scatters tares in the furrows, gathers wheat into his garners; so, in the final dispensations of Providence, the same correspondence shall be found in the moral system; every action shall at last be followed by its due consequences; we shall be treated according to our obedience or transgressions; the good shall not miss their reward, nor the wicked escape their punishment; but, when men shall give account of their own works, they that have done good shall pass into everlasting life, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.

Let us, therefore, at this and at all times, moſt heartily and fervently beſeech Almighty God to give us faithful and ſincere repentance, to pardon and forgive us all our ſins, to endue us with the grace of his Holy Spirit, and to amend our lives according to his holy will and commandments.

SERMON XI.

1 PETER, CHAP. iii. VER. 8.

Finally be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another, love as brethren, be faithful, be courteous.

THE apostle, directing this epistle to the new converts scattered over the provinces of Asia, having laid before them the great advantage of the religion which they had embraced, no less than the salvation of their souls, and the high price for which they were redeemed, the precious blood of Christ, proceeds to explain to them what is required by their *new* profession. He reminds them that they live among the heathen, of whom it must necessarily be supposed that every one watched their conduct with suspicious vigilance; and that it is *their* duty to recommend *right belief* by *virtuous practice*: that their *example*, as well as their *arguments*, may propagate the truth.

In this course of instruction, the first mentions the civil relation of governors and subjects, and enjoins them to honour the supreme magistrate, and to respect all subordinate authority which is established for the preservation of order and the administration of justice. He then descends to domestic connections, and recommends to servants obedience and patience, and to husbands and wives their relative and respective duties; to husbands tenderness, and to wives obedience, modesty and gentleness; that the husband, who is not yet converted by the power of exhortation, may be drawn to the religion of his wife, by perceiving its good effects upon her conversation and behaviour.

He then extends his precepts to greater generality, and lays down a short system of domestic virtue to be universally adopted, directing the new christians,

First, to be all of one mind.

By the union of minds, which the apostle recommends, it must be supposed that he means, not speculative, but practical union; not similitude of opinions, but similitude of virtues. In religious opinions, if there was then any disagreement, they had then living authority to which they might have recourse: and their business was probably, at that time, more to defend their common faith against the heathen, than to debate any subtilties of opinion among themselves. But there are innumerable questions, in which vanity or interest engages mankind, which have little connection with their eternal interest; and yet often inflame the passions and produce dislike and malevolence. Sects in philosophy, and factions in the state, easily excite mutual contempt, or mutual hatred. He, whose opinions are censured, feels the reputation of his understanding injured; he whose party is opposed, finds his influence resisted, and perhaps his power or his profit in danger of diminution. It could not be the intention of St. Peter, that all men should think alike, either of the operations of nature, or the transactions of the state, but that those who thought differently should live in peace; that contradiction should not exasperate the disputants, or that the heat should end with the controversy, and that the opposition of party (for such there must sometimes be) should not canker the private thoughts, or raise personal hatred or insidious enmity. He required that they should be all of one *moral* mind, that they should all wish and promote the happiness of each other, that the danger of a christian should be a common cause, and that no one should wish for advantage by the miscarriage of another.

To suppose that there should, in any community, be no difference of opinion, is to suppose all, of whom that community consists, to be wise alike, which cannot happen; or that

the underſtanding of one part is ſubmitted to that of another, which, however, would not produce uniformity of opinion, but only of profeſſion; and is, in important queſtions, contrary to that ſincerity and integrity which truth requires; and an infraction of that liberty which reaſon allows. But that men, of different opinions, ſhould live at peace, is the true effect of that humility which makes each eſteem others better than himſelf, and of that moderation which reaſon approves and charity commands. Be ye, therefore, all of one mind; let charity be the predominant and univerſal principle that pervades your lives and regulates your actions.

Secondly, they are directed by the apoſtle to live as men which have compaſſion one of another.

The word, which is rendered *having compaſſion*, ſeems to include a greater latitude of ſignification than the word compaſſion commonly obtains. Compaſſion is not uſed but in the ſenſe of tender regard to the unhappineſs of another. But the term uſed by St. Peter may mean mutually feeling for each other, receiving the ſame impreſſions from the ſame things, and this ſenſe ſeems to be given it by one of the tranſlators (Caſtalio.) The precept will then be connected and conſequential; *Be all of one mind, each feeling, by ſympathy, the affections of another.*

Sympathy, the quality recommended in the text, as it has been now explained, is the great ſource of ſocial happineſs. To gain affection and to preſerve concord, it is neceſſary not only to mourn with thoſe that mourn, but to rejoice with them that rejoice.

To feel ſincere and honeſt joy at the ſucceſs of another, though it is neceſſary to true friendſhip, is perhaps neither very common nor very eaſy. There is in every mind, implanted by nature, a deſire of ſuperiority, which counteracts the pleaſure which the ſight of ſucceſs and happineſs ought always to impart. Between men of equal condition, and therefore willingly conſulting with each other, any flow of fortune which produces inequality, makes him who is left be-

hind look with less content on his own condition, and with less kindness on him who has reduced him to inferiority. The advancement of a superior gives pain by increasing that distance, by difference of station, which was thought already greater than could be claimed by any difference; and the rise of an inferior excites jealousy, lest he that went before should be overtaken by his follower. As cruelty looks upon misery without partaking pain, so envy beholds increase of happiness without partaking joy.

Envy and cruelty, the most hateful passions of the human breast, are both counteracted by this precept, which commanded the christians of Asia, and now commands us who succeed them in the profession of the same faith and the consciousness of the same frailties, to feel one for another. He whose mind is so harmonized to the interest of his neighbour, that good and evil is common to them both, will neither obstruct his rise nor insult his fall; but will be willing to co-operate with him through all the vicissitudes of life and dispensations of providence; to honour him that is exalted; to help him that is depressed. He will controul all those emotions which comparison produces; he will not consider himself as made poorer by another's wealth, or richer by another's poverty; he will look, without malignity, upon superiority, either external or intellectual; he will be willing to learn of those that excel in wisdom, and receive instruction with thankfulness; he will be willing to impart his knowledge, without fearing lest he should impair his own importance by the improvement of his hearer.

How much this generous sympathy would conduce to the comfort and stability of life, a little consideration will convince us. Whence are all the arts of slander and depreciation, but from our unwillingness to see others greater, or wiser, or happier than ourselves? Whence is a great part of the splendour, and all the ostentation of high rank, but to receive pleasure from the contemplation of those who cannot attain dignity and riches, or to give pain to them who look with

malignity on those acquisitions which they have desired in vain? Whence is the pain which vanity suffers from neglect, but that it exacted painful homage and honour, which is received with more delight as it is more unwillingly conferred? The pleasures of comparative excellence have commonly their source in the pain of others, and therefore are such pleasures as the apostle warns the christians not to indulge.

Thirdly, In pursuance of his injunctions to be of one mind, and to sympathize one with another, he directs them to love as brethren, or to be lovers of the brethren, (Hammond.) He endeavours to establish a species of fraternity among christians; that, as they have ~~all one~~ faith, they may have all one interest, and consider themselves as a family that must prosper or suffer all together, and share whatever shall befal, either of good or evil. The highest degree of friendship is called brotherly love; and the term by which man is endeared to man, in the language of the gospel, is the appellation of brother. We are all brethren by our common relation to the universal father; but that relation is often forgotten amongst the contrariety of opinions and opposition of passions which disturb the peace of the world. Ambition has effaced all natural consanguinity, by calling nation to war against nation, and making the destruction of one half of mankind the glory of the other. Christian piety, as it revived and enforced all the original and primeval duties of humanity, so it restored, in some degree, that brotherhood, or foundation of kindness which naturally arises from some common relation. We are brothers as we are men; we are again brothers as we are christians; as men, we are brothers by natural necessity; but as christians, we are brothers by voluntary choice, and are therefore under an apparent obligation to fulfil the relation; *first*, as it is established by our Creator, and, afterwards, as it is chosen by ourselves. To have the same opinions naturally produces kindness, even when these opinions have no consequence; because we rejoice to find our sentiments approved by the judgment of another. But those who concur in christ-

tianity, have, by that agreement in principles, an opportunity of more than ſpeculative kindneſs; they may help forward the ſalvation of each other, by counſel or by reproof, by exhortation, by example; they may recal each other from deviations, they may excite each other to good works.

Charity, or univerſal love, is named by Saint Paul, as the greateſt and moſt illuſtrious of chriſtian virtues; and our Saviour himſelf has told us, that by this it ſhall be known that we are his diſciples, if we love one another. Every affection of the ſoul exerts itſelf moſt ſtrongly at the approach of its proper object. Chriſtians particularly love one another, becauſe they can confer and receive ſpiritual benefits. They are indeed to love all men; and how much the primitive preachers of the goſpel loved thoſe that differed from them, they ſufficiently ſhewed, when they incurred death by their endeavours to make them chriſtians. This is the extent of evangelical love, to bring into the light of truth those who are in darkneſs, and to keep thoſe from falling back into darkneſs to whom the light has been ſhewn.

Since life overflows with miſery, and the world is filled with evil, natural and moral, with temptation and danger, with calamity and wickedneſs, there are very frequent opportunities of ſhewing our unanimity, our ſympathy, and our brotherly love, by attempts to remove preſſures and mitigate misfortunes. St. Peter, therefore, particularly preſſes the duty of commiſeration, by calling upon us,

Fourthly, to be pitiful, not to look negligently or ſcornfully on the miſeries of others, but to apply ſuch conſolation and aſſiſtance as Providence puts into our power.

To attempt an enumeration of all the opportunities which may occur for the exerciſe of pity, would be to form a catalogue of all the ills to which human nature is expoſed, to count over all the poſſibilities of calamity, and recount the depredations of time, the pains of diſeaſe, the blaſts of caſualty, and the miſchiefs of malevolence.

Wherever the eye is turned, it ſees much miſery, and

there is much which it sees not; many complaints are heard, and there are many pangs without complaint. The external acts of mercy, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, and to visit the sick, and the prisoners, we see daily opportunities of performing; and it may be hoped they are not neglected by those that abound with what others want.

But there are other calls upon charity. There are sick minds as well as sick bodies; there are *understandings* perplexed with scruples, there are consciences tormented with guilt; nor can any greater benefit be conferred, than that of settling doubts, or comforting despair, and restoring a disquieted soul to hope and tranquillity.

The duty of commiseration is so strongly pressed by the gospel, that none deny its obligations. But as the measures of beneficence are left undefined, every man necessarily determines for himself, whether he has contributed his share to the necessities of others; and amidst the general depravity of the world, it can be no wonder if there are found some who tax themselves very lightly, and are satisfied with giving very little.

Some readily find out, that where there is distress there is vice, and easily discover the crime of feeding the lazy, or encouraging the dissolute. To promote vice is certainly unlawful, but we do not always encourage vice when we relieve the vicious. It is sufficient that our brother is in want; by which way he brought his want upon him let us not too curiously enquire. We likewise are sinners. In cases undoubted and notorious, some caution may be properly used, that charity be not perverted; but no man is so bad as to lose his title to christian kindness. If a bad man be suffered to perish, how shall he repent?

Not more justifiable is the omission of duty, which proceeds from an expectation of better opportunities, or more pressing exigencies. Of such excuses, or of such purposes, there can be no end. Delay not till to-morrow what thou mayest do to-day. A good work is now in thy power, be

quick and perform it! By *thy* refusal, *others* may be discouraged from asking; or so near may be the end of thy life that thou mayest never do what is in thy heart. Every call to charity is a gift of God, to be received with thankfulness, and improved with diligence.

There are likewise many offices of kindness which cannot properly be classed under the duty of commiseration, as they do not presuppose either misery or necessity, and yet are of great use for conciliating affection, and smoothing the paths of life; and, as it is of great importance that goodness should have the power of gaining the affections, the apostle has not neglected those subordinate duties, for he commands christians,

Fifthly, to be courteous.

For courteous, some substitute the word humble; the difference may not be considered as great, for pride is a quality that obstructs courtesy.

That a precept of courtesy is by no means unworthy of the gravity and dignity of an apostolical mandate, may be gathered from the pernicious effects which all must have observed to have arisen from harsh strictness and sour virtue, such as refuses to mingle in harmless gaiety, or give countenance to innocent amusements, or which transacts the petty business of the day with a gloomy ferociousness that clouds existence. Goodness of this character is more formidable than lovely; it may drive away vice from its presence, but will never persuade it to stay to be amended; it may teach, it may remonstrate, but the hearer will seek for more mild instruction. To those, therefore, by whose conversation the heathens were to be drawn away from error and wickedness, it is the apostle's precept, that they be courteous, that they accommodate themselves, as far as innocence allows, to the will of others; that they should practise all the established modes of civility, seize all occasions of cultivating kindness, and live with the rest of the world in an amicable reciprocation of cursory civility, that christianity might not be accused of making men less cheerful as companions, less sociable as neighbours, or less useful as friends.

Such is the ſyſtem of domeſtic virtue which the apoſtle recommends. His words are few, but their meaning is ſufficient to fill the greater part of the circle of life. Let us remember to be all of one mind, ſo as to grieve and rejoice together; to confirm, by conſtant benevolence, that brotherhood which creation and redemption have conſtituted! Let us commiſerate and relieve affliction, and endear ourſelves by general gentleneſs and affability; it will from hence ſoon appear how much goodneſs is to be loved, and how much human nature is meliorated by religion.

SERMON XII.

ECCLESIASTES, CHAP. I. VER. 14.

I have seen all the works that are done under the Sun: and, behold, all is vanity and vexation of spirit.

THAT all human actions terminate in vanity, and all human hopes will end in vexation, is a position from which nature withholds our credulity, and which our fondness for the present life and worldly enjoyments disposes us to doubt, however forcibly it may be urged upon us by reason or experience.

Every man will readily enough confess that his own condition discontents him, and that he has not yet been able, with all his labour, to make happiness, or, with all his enquiries, to find it. But he still thinks it is somewhere to be found, or by some means to be procured. His envy sometimes persuades him to imagine that others possess it; and his ambition points the way by which he supposes that he shall reach, at last, the station to which it is annexed. Every one wants something to happiness; and when he has gained what he first wanted, he wants something else; he wears out life in efforts and pursuits, and perhaps dies, regretting that he must leave the world, when he is about to enjoy it.

So great is our interest, or so great we think it, to believe ourselves able to procure our own happiness, that experience never convinces us of our impotence; and indeed our miscarriages might be reasonably enough imputed by us to our own unskillfulness, or ignorance, if we were able to derive in-

telligence from no experience but our own. But *surely we* may be content to credit the general voice of mankind, complaining incessantly of general infelicity; and when we see the restlessness of the young, and the peevishness of the old; when we find the daring and the active combating misery, and the calm and humble lamenting it; when the vigorous are exhausting themselves in struggles with their own condition, and the old and the wise retiring from the contest in weariness and despondency; we may be content at last to conclude, that if happiness had been to be found, some would have found it, and that it is vain to search longer for what all have missed.

But though our obstinacy should hold out against common experience and common authority, it might at least give way to the declaration of Solomon, who has left this testimony to succeeding ages; that all human pursuits and labours are vanity. From the like conclusion made by other men, we may escape; by considering, that *their* experience was *small*, and *their* power narrow; that they pronounced *with* confidence upon that, which they could not know; and that many pleasures might be above their reach, and many more beyond their observation; *they* may be considered, as uttering the dictates of discontent, rather than persuasion; and as speaking not so much of the general state of things, as of their own share, and their own situation.

But the character of Solomon leaves no room for subterfuge; he did not judge of what he did not know. He had in his possession whatever power and riches, and, what is still more, whatever wisdom and knowledge, could confer. As he understood the vegetable creation, from the cedar of Libanus, to the hyssop on the wall; so there is no doubt, but he had taken a survey of all the gradations of human life, from the throne of the prince to the shepherd's cottage. He had in his hand all the instruments of happiness, and in his mind the skill to apply them. Every power of delight which others possessed, he had authority to summon, or wealth to purchase; all that royal prosperity could supply was accumulated upon

him; at home he had peace, and in foreign countries he had honour; what every nation could supply, was poured down before him. If power be grateful, he was a king; if there be pleasure in knowledge, he was the wisest of mankind; if wealth can purchase happiness, he had so much gold that silver was little regarded. Over all these advantages presided a mind in the highest degree disposed to magnificence and voluptuousness, so eager in pursuit of gratification that, alas! after every other price had been bid for happiness, religion and virtue were brought to the sale. But after the anxiety of his enquiries, the weariness of his labours, and the loss of his innocence, he obtained only this conclusion: *I have seen all the works that are done under the Sun: and behold, all is vanity and vexation of spirit.*

That this result of Solomon's experience, thus solemnly bequeathed by him to all generations, may not be transmitted to us without its proper use, let us diligently consider,

First, In what sense we are to understand, that all is vanity;

Secondly, How far the conviction, that all is vanity, ought to influence the conduct of life.

Thirdly, What consequences the serious and religious mind may deduce from the position, that all is vanity.

When we examine, first, in what sense we are to understand that all is vanity, we must remember that the preacher is not speaking of religious practices, or of any actions immediately commanded by God, or directly referred to him; but of such employments as we pursue by choice, and such works as we perform, in hopes of a recompense in the present life; such as flatter the imagination with pleasing scenes and probable increase of temporal felicity; of this he determines that all is vanity, and every hour confirms his determination.

The event of all human endeavours is uncertain. He that plants may gather no fruit; he that sows may reap no harvest. Even the most simple operations are liable to miscarriage, from causes which we cannot foresee, and, if we could foresee them, cannot prevent. What can be more vain, than the

confidence of man, when the annual provision made for the support of life is not only exposed to the uncertainty of the weather, and the variation of the sky, but lies at the mercy of the reptiles of the earth, or the insects of the air? The rain and the wind he cannot command; the caterpillar he cannot destroy; and the locust he cannot drive away.

But these effects, which require only the concurrence of natural causes, though they depend little upon human power, are yet made by Providence regular and certain, in comparison with those extensive and complicated undertakings which must be brought to pass by the agency of man, and which require the union of many understandings, and the co-operation of many hands. The history of mankind is little else than a narrative of designs which have failed, and hopes that have been disappointed. In all matters of emulation and contest, the success of one implies the defeat of another, and at least half the transaction terminates in misery. And in designs not directly contrary to the interest of another, and therefore not opposed either by artifice or violence, it frequently happens that, by negligence or mistake, or unseasonable officiousness, a very hopeful project is brought to nothing.

To find examples of disappointment and uncertainty, we need not raise our thoughts to the interests of nations, nor follow the warrior to the field, or the statesman to the council. The little transactions of private families are entangled with perplexities; and the hourly occurrences of common life are filling the world with discontent and complaint. Every man hopes for kindness from his friends, diligence from his servants, and obedience from his children; yet friends are often unfaithful, servants negligent, and children rebellious. Human wisdom has, indeed, exhausted its power in giving rules for the conduct of life, but those rules are themselves but vanities. They are difficult to be observed, and, though observed, are uncertain in the effect.

The labours of man are not only uncertain, but imperfect. If we perform what we designed, we yet do not obtain what

as expected. What appeared great when we desired it, seems little when it is attained; the wish is still unsatisfied, and something always remains behind without which the gratification is incomplete. He that rises to greatness, finds himself in danger; he that obtains riches, perceives that he cannot gain esteem. He that is caressed, sees interest lurking under kindness; and he that hears his own praises, suspects that he is flattered. Discontent and doubt are always pursuing us. Our endeavours end without performance, and performance ends without satisfaction.

But, since this uncertainty and imperfection is the lot which our Creator has appointed for us, we are to enquire,

Secondly, How far the conviction, that all is vanity, ought to influence the conduct of life.

Human actions may be distinguished into various classes. Some are actions of duty, which can never be vain, because God will reward them. Yet these actions, considered as terminating in this world, will often produce vexation. It is our duty to admonish the vicious, to instruct the ignorant, and relieve the poor; and our admonitions will, sometimes, produce anger instead of amendment; our instructions will be sometimes bestowed upon the perverse, the stupid and the inattentive; and our charity will be sometimes misapplied by those that receive it, and, instead of feeding the hungry, will pamper the intemperate; but these disappointments do not make good actions vain, though they shew us how much all success depends upon causes on which we have no influence.

There are likewise actions of necessity; these are often vain and vexatious; but such is the order of the world, that they cannot be omitted. He that will eat bread must plow and sow; though it is not certain that he who plows and sows shall eat bread. It is appointed, that life should be sustained by labour; and we must not sink down in sullen idleness when our industry is permitted to miscarry. We shall

often have occasion to remember the sentence denounced by the preacher upon all that is done under the sun; but we must still prosecute our business, confess our imbecility, and turn our eyes upon Him, whose mercy is over all his works, and who, though he humbles our pride, will succour our necessities.

Works of absolute necessity are few and simple; a very great part of human diligence is laid out in accommodations of ease, or refinements of pleasure; and the further we pass beyond the boundaries of necessity, the more we lose ourselves in the regions of vanity, and the more we expose ourselves to vexation of spirit. As we extend our pleasures, we multiply our wants. The pain of hunger is easily appeased; but to surmount the disgust of appetite vitiated by indulgence, all the arts of luxury are required, and all are often vain. When to the enjoyments of sense are superadded the delights of fancy, we form a scheme of happiness that never can be complete, for we can always imagine more than we possess. All social pleasures put us more or less in the power of others, who sometimes cannot, and sometimes will not please us. Conversations of argument often end in bitterness of controversy; and conversations of mirth, in petulance and folly. Friendship is violated by interest, or broken by passion; and benevolence finds its kindness bestowed on the worthless and ungrateful.

But most certain is the disappointment of him who places his happiness in comparative good, and considers, not what he himself wants, but what others have. The delight of eminence must, by its own nature, be rare, because he that is eminent must have many below him, and, therefore, if we suppose such desires general, as very general they are, *the happiness of a few* must arise from *the misery of many*. He that places his delight in the extent of his renown, is, in some degree, at the mercy of every tongue; not only malevolence, but indifference may disturb him; and he may be pained, not only

by those who speak ill, but by those likewise that say nothing.

As every engine of artificial motion, as it consists of more parts, is in more danger of deficience and disorder; so every effect, as it requires the agency of greater numbers, is more likely to fail. Yet what pleasure is granted to man, beyond the gross gratifications of sense, common to him with other animals, that does not demand the help of others, and the help of greater numbers as the pleasure is sublimated and enlarged? And, since such is the constitution of things, that whatever can give pleasure can likewise cause uneasiness, there is little hope that uneasiness will be long escaped. Of them, whose offices are necessary to felicity, some will be perverse, and some will be unskillful; some will negligently withhold their contributions, and some will enviously withdraw them. The various and opposite directions of the human mind, which divide men into so many different occupations, keep all the inhabitants of the earth perpetually busy; but when it is considered that the business of every man is to counteract the purpose of some other man, it will appear, that universal activity cannot contribute much to universal happiness. Of those that contend, one must necessarily be overcome; and he that prevails never has his labour rewarded to his wish, but finds that he has been contending for that which cannot satisfy, and engaged in a contest where even victory is vanity.

What then is the influence which the conviction of this unwelcome truth ought to have upon our conduct? It ought to teach us humility, patience, and diffidence. When we consider how little we know of the distant consequences of our own actions, how little the greatest personal qualities can protect us from misfortune, how much all our importance depends upon the favour of others, how uncertainly that favour is bestowed, and how easily it is lost; we shall find that we have very little reason to be proud. That which is most apt to elate the thoughts, height of place and greatness of power,

is the gift of others. No man can, by any natural or intrinsic faculties, maintain himself in a state of superiority; he is exalted to his place, whatever it be, by the concurrence of those who are for a time content to be counted his inferiors; he has no authority in himself; he is only able to controul some by the help of others. If dependence be a state of humiliation, every man has reason to be humble, for every man is dependent.

But however unpleasing these considerations may be, however unequal our condition is to all our wishes or conceptions, we are not to admit impatience into our bosoms, or increase the evils of life by vain throbs of discontent. To live in a world where all is vanity, has been decreed by our Creator to be the lot of man, a lot which we cannot alter by murmuring; but may soften by submission.

The consideration of the vanity of all human purposes and projects, deeply impressed upon the mind, necessarily produces that diffidence in all worldly good, which is necessary to the regulation of our passions and the security of our innocence. In a smooth course of prosperity, an unobstructed progression from wish to wish, while the success of one design facilitates another, and the opening prospect of life shews pleasures at a distance, to conclude that the passage will be always clear, and that the delights which solicit from far will, when they are attained, fill the soul with enjoyments, must necessarily produce violent desires and eager pursuits, contempt of those that are behind and malignity to those that are before. But the full persuasion that all earthly good is uncertain in the attainment, and unstable in the possession, and the frequent recollection of the slender supports on which we rest, and the dangers which are always hanging over us, will dictate inoffensive modesty and mild benevolence. *He* does not rashly treat another with contempt who doubts the duration of his own superiority: *he* will not refuse assistance to the distressed who supposes that he may quickly need it himself.

He that considers how imperfectly human wisdom can judge of that which has not been tried, will seldom think any possibilities of advantage worthy of vehement desire. As his hopes are moderate, his endeavours will be calm. He will not fix his fond hopes upon things which he knows to be vanity, but will enjoy this world as one who knows that he does not possess it: and that this is the disposition which becomes our condition, will appear, when we consider.

Thirdly, What consequences the serious and religious mind may draw from the position, that all is vanity.

When the present state of man is considered, when an estimate is made of his hopes, his pleasures, and his possessions; when his hopes appear to be deceitful, his labours ineffectual, his pleasures unsatisfactory, and his possessions fugitive, it is natural to wish for an abiding city, for a state more constant and permanent, of which the objects may be more proportioned to our wishes, and the enjoyments to our capacities; and from this wish it is reasonable to infer, that such a state is designed for us by that Infinite Wisdom, which, as it does nothing in vain, has not created minds with comprehensions never to be filled. When revelation is consulted, it appears that such a state is really promised, and that, by the contempt of worldly pleasures, it is to be obtained. We then find that, instead of lamenting the imperfection of earthly things, we have reason to pour out thanks to Him who orders all for our good, that he has made the world such as often deceives and often afflicts us; that the charms of interest are not such as our frailty is unable to resist, but that we have such interruptions of our pursuits, and such languor in our enjoyments, such pains of body and anxieties of mind, as repress desire and weaken temptation: and happy will it be, if we follow the gracious directions of Providence, and determine that no degree of earthly felicity shall be purchased with a crime; if we resolve no longer to bear the chains of sin, to employ all our endeavours upon transitory and imperfect

pleasures, or to divide our thought between the world and heaven; but to bid farewel to sublunary vanities, to endure no longer an unprofitable vexation of spirit, but with pure heart and steady faith to fear God and to keep his commandments, and remember that this is the whole duty of man.

SERMON XIII.

2 TIMOTHY, chap. iii. part of the 5th verse.

Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.

WHEN St. Paul, in the precepts given to Timothy for his instruction how to regulate and purify the conversation of the first christians, directed him to take care that those men should be avoided as dangerous and pestilent, who, having the form of godliness, denied the power; it is reasonable to believe that he meant, in his direct and immediate intention, to awaken his caution against gross hypocrites; such as may easily be supposed to have appeared too often in the most early seminaries of christianity; who made an appearance of righteousness subservient to worldly interest; and whose conversion, real or pretended, gave them an opportunity of preying upon artless simplicity, by claiming that kindness which the first believers shewed to one another; and obtaining benefactions which they did not want, and eating bread for which they did not labour.

To impostors of this kind, the peculiar state of the first christians would naturally expose them. As they were surrounded by enemies, they were glad to find, in any man, the appearance of a friend; as they were wearied with importunate contradiction, they were desirous of an interval of respite by consorting with any one that professed the same opinions; and what was still more favourable to such impostors, when they had, by embracing an unpopular and persecuted religion, divested themselves, in a great degree, of secular interest, they

were likely often to want that vigilance and suspicion which is forced, even upon honest minds, by much commerce with the world and frequent transactions with various characters; and which our divine Master teaches us to practice, when he commands us to join the *wisdom of the serpent with the harmlessness of the dove.* The first christians must have been, in the highest degree, zealous to strengthen their faith in themselves, and propagate it in others; and zeal easily spreads the arms and opens the bosom to an adherent, or a proselyte, as to one that adds another suffrage to truth, and strengthens the support of a good cause. Men of this disposition and in this state of life, would easily be enamoured of the *form* of godliness, and not soon discover that the *power* was wanting. Men naturally think of others like themselves, and therefore a good man is easily persuaded to credit the appearance of virtue.

Hypocrisy, however, was not confined to the apostolic ages. All times and all places have produced men that have endeavoured to gain credit by false pretensions to excellence, and have recommended themselves to kindness or esteem by specious professions, and ostentatious displays of counterfeited virtues. It is, however, less necessary now to obviate this kind of fraud by exhortations to caution; for that simplicity which lay open to its operation, is not now very frequently to be found. The hypocrite, in these times, seldom boasts of much success. He is, for the most part, soon discovered; and when he is once known, the world will not wait for counsel to avoid him, for the good detest, and the bad despise him. He is hated for his attempts, and scorned for his miscarriage.

It may therefore be proper to consider the danger of a *form of righteousness* without the *power*, in a different and secondary sense; and to examine whether, as there are some who by this form deceive others, there are not some, likewise, that deceive themselves; who pacify their consciences with an appearance of piety, and live and die in dangerous tranquillity and delusive confidence.

In this enquiry it will be proper to consider, first, what may be understood by the *form* of godliness, as distinct from the *power*.

Secondly, What is that power of godliness, without which the form is defective and unavailing.

Thirdly, How far it is necessary to the christian life, that the form and power should subsist together.

Let it therefore be first considered, what may be easily and naturally understood by the form of godliness as distinct from the power.

By the form of godliness, may be properly understood, not only a specious practice of religious duties, exhibited to public notice, but all external acts of worship, all rites and ceremonies, all stated observances, and all compliance with temporary and local injunctions and regularities.

The religion of the Jews, from the time of Moses, comprised a great number of burthensome ceremonies, required by God for reasons which perhaps human wisdom has never fully discovered. Of these ceremonies, however, some were typically representative of the christian institution; and some, by keeping them distinct, by dissimilitude of customs, from the nations that surrounded them, had a tendency to secure them from the influence of ill example, and preserve them from the contagion of idolatry.

To the use of observances, thus important, they were confined by the strongest obligations. They were indeed external acts, but they were instituted by divine authority; they were not to be considered merely as instrumental and expedient, as means which might be omitted, if their ends were secured; they were positively enjoined by the supreme ligislator, and were not left to choice or discretion, or secular laws; to the will of the powerful, or the judgment of the prudent.

Yet even these sacred rites might be punctually performed, without making the performer acceptable to God; the blood of bulls and of goats might be poured out in vain, if the desires were not regulated, or the passions subdued. The sacri-

fices of the oppressor, or extortioner, were not an atonement, but an abomination. Forgiveness was obtained, not by incense, but by repentance; the offender was required to rend his heart, and not his garment; a contrite and a broken heart was the oblation which the supreme Judge did not despise.

So much was the moral law exalted above all ceremonial institutions, even in that dispensation by which so many ceremonies were commanded, that those two parts of duty were distinguished by the appellations of body and spirit. As the body, separated from the spirit, is a mass, lifeless, motionless, and useless; so the external practice of ritual observances was ineffectual and vain, an action without a meaning, a labour by which nothing was produced. As the spirit puts the limbs into motion, and directs their action to an end, so justice and mercy gave energy to ceremonies, made the oblation grateful, and the worshipper accepted.

The professors of Christianity have few ceremonies indispensably enjoined them. Their religion teaches them to worship God, not with local or temporary ceremonies, but in spirit and in truth; that is, with internal purity, and moral righteousness. For spirit, in this sense, seems to be opposed to the body of external rites; and truth is known to signify, in the biblical language, the sum of those duties which we owe to one another.

Yet such are the temptations of interest and pleasure, and so prevalent is the desire of enjoying at once the pleasures of sin for a season, and the hopes of happiness to eternity, that even the christian religion has been depraved by artificial modes of piety, and succedaneous practices of reconciliation. Men have ever been persuaded, that by doing something, to which they think themselves not obliged, they may purchase an exemption from such duties as they find themselves inclined to violate; that they may commute with Heaven for a temporal fine, and make rigour atone for relaxity.

In ages and countries, in which ignorance has produced and nourished superstition, many artifices have been invent-

ed of practising piety without virtue, and repentance without amendment. The devotion of our blind fore-fathers consisted, for a great part, in rigorous austerities, laborious pilgrimages, and gloomy retirement; and that which now prevails, in the darker provinces of the popish world, exhausts its power in absurd veneration for some particular saint, expressed too often by honours paid to his image, or in a stated number of prayers, uttered with very little attention, and very frequently with little understanding.

Some of these practices may be perhaps justly imputed to the grossness of a people, scarcely capable of worship purely intellectual; to the necessity of complying with the weakness of men, who must be taught their duty by material images, and sensible impressions. This plea, however, will avail but little, in defence of abuses not only permitted, but encouraged by pertinacious vindications, and fictitious miracles.

It is apparent that the Romish Clergy have attributed too much efficacy to pious donations and charitable establishments; and that they have made liberality to the church, and bounty to the poor, equivalent to the whole system of our duty to God, and to our neighbour.

Yet nothing can be more repugnant to the general tenour of the Evangelical Revelation, than an opinion that pardon may be bought, and guilt effaced, by a stipulated expiation. We naturally catch the pleasures of the present hour, and gratify the calls of the reigning passion: and what shall hinder the man of violence from outrage and mischief, or restrain the pursuer of interest from fraud and circumvention, when they are told, that after a life passed in disturbing the peace of life, and violating the security of possession, they may die at last in peace, by founding an alms-house, without the agonies of deep contrition?

But error and corruption are often to be found where there are neither Jews nor Papists.—Let us not look upon the depravity of others with triumph, nor censure it with bitter-

hess.—Every sect may find, in its own followers, those who have the form of godliness, without the power; every man, if he examines his own conduct, without intention to be his own flatterer, may, to a certain degree, find it in himself.

To give the heart to God, and to give the whole heart, is very difficult; the last, the great effort of long labour, fervent prayer, and diligent meditation.—Many resolutions are made, and many relapses lamented; and many conflicts with our own desires, with the powers of this world, and the powers of darkness must be sustained, before the will of man is made wholly obedient to the will of God.

In the mean time, we are willing to find some way to Heaven, less difficult and less obstructed, to keep our hopes alive by faint endeavours, and to lull our consciences by such expedients as we may easily practice. Not yet resolved to live wholly to God, and yet afraid to live wholly to the world, we do something in recompense for that which we neglect, and resign something that we may keep the rest.

To be strictly religious is difficult, but we may be zealously religious at little expense.—By expressing on all occasions our detestation of heresy and popery, and all other errors, we erect ourselves into champions for truth, without much hazard or trouble.—The hopes of zeal are not wholly groundless. Indifference in questions of importance is no amiable quality. He that is warm for truth, and fearless in its defence, performs one of the duties of a good man; he strengthens his own conviction, and guards others from delusion; but steadiness of belief, and boldness of profession, are yet only part of the form of godliness, which may be attained by those who deny the power.

As almost every man is, by nature or by accident, exposed to danger from particular temptations, and disposed to some vices more than to others; so all are, either by disposition of mind or the circumstances of life, inclined or impelled to some laudable practices. Of this happy tendency it is common to take advantage, by pushing the favourite or the com-

venient virtue to its utmost extent, and to lose all sense of deficiency in the perpetual contemplation of some single excellence.

Thus some please themselves with a constant regularity of life, and decency of behaviour,—they hear themselves commended, and superadd their own approbation. They know, or might know, that they have secret faults; but, as they are not open to accusation, they are not inquisitive to their own disquiet; they are satisfied that they do not corrupt others, and that the world will not be worse by their example.

Some are punctual in the attendance on public worship, and perhaps in the performance of private devotion. These they know to be great duties, and resolve not to neglect them. It is right they go so far; and with so much that is right they are satisfied. They are diligent in adoration, but defective in obedience.

Such men are often not hypocrites; the virtues which they practice arise from their principles. The man of regularity really hopes that he shall recommend goodness to those that know him. The frequenter of the church really hopes to propitiate his Creator. Their religion is sincere; what is reprehensible is, that it is partial, that the heart is yet not purified, and that yet many inordinate desires remain not only unsubdued, but unsuspected, under the splendid cover of some specious practice, with which the mind delights itself too much to take a rigorous survey of its own motions.

In condemnation of those who presume to hope, that the performance of one duty will obtain excuse for the violation of others, it is affirmed by St. James, that the who breaks one commandment is guilty of all; and he defends his position by observing, that they are all delivered by the same authority.

His meaning is not, that all crimes are equal, or that in any one crime all others are involved; but that the law of God is to be obeyed with complete and unreserved submis-

sion; and that he who violates any of its ordinances, will not be justified by his observation of all the rest, since as the whole is of divine authority, every breach, wilful and unrepented, is an act of rebellion against omnipotence.

One of the artifices, by which men, thus defectively religious, deceive themselves, is that of comparing their own behaviour with that of men openly vicious, and generally negligent; and inferring that themselves are good, because they suppose that they see others worse. The account of the Pharisee and publican may shew us that, in raising our own merit, we are in danger of mistake. But though the estimate should be right, it is still to be remembered, that he who is not worst, may yet fall far below what will be required. Our rule of duty is not *the virtue of men*, but *the law of God*, from which alone we can learn what will be required.

Secondly, What is that power of godliness without which the form is defective and unavailing?

The power of godliness is contained in the love of God and of our neighbour; in that sum of religion, in which, as we are told by the Saviour of the world, the law and the prophets are comprised. The love of God will engage us to trust in his protection, to acquiesce in his dispensations, to keep his laws, to meditate on his perfection, and to declare our confidence and submission by profound and frequent adoration, to impress his glory on our minds by songs of praise, to inflame our gratitude by acts of thanksgiving, to strengthen our faith, and exalt our hope, by pious meditations, and to implore his protection of our imbecility, and his assistance of our frailty, by humble supplication: and when we love God with the whole heart, the power of godliness will be shewn by steadiness in temptation, by patience in affliction, by faith in the divine promises, by perpetual dread of sin, by continual aspirations after higher degrees of holiness, and contempt of the pains and pleasures of the world, when they obstruct the progress of religious excellence.

The power of godliness, as it is exerted in the love of our

neighbour, appears in the exact and punctual discharge of all the relative and social duties. He, whom this power actuates and directs, will regulate his conduct, so as neither to do injury, nor willingly to give offence. He will neither be a tyrannical governor, nor a seditious subject; neither a cruel parent, nor a disobedient son; neither an oppressive master, nor an eye-servant. But he will not stop at negative goodness, nor rest in the mere forbearance of evil; he will search out occasions of beneficence, and extend his care to those who have no other claim to his attention than the great community of relation to the universal Father of mankind. To enumerate the various modes of charity, which true godliness may suggest, is it difficult, would be useless. They are as extensive as want, and as various as misery.

We must however remember, that where the form of godliness appears, we must not always suppose the power to be wanting, because its influence is not universal and complete; nor think every man to be avoided, in whom we discover either defective virtues, or actual faults. The power subsists in him who is contending with corruption, though he has not yet entirely subdued it. He who falleth seven times a day may yet, by the mercy of God, be numbered among the just; the purest human virtue has much fæculence. The highest flights of the soul soar not beyond the clouds and vapours of the earth; the greatest attainments are very imperfect; and he who is most advanced in excellence was once in a lower state, and in that lower state was yet worthy of love and reverence. One instance of the power of godliness is readiness to help the weak and comfort the fallen, to look with compassion upon the frail, to rekindle those whose ardour is cooling, and to recal those who, by inadvertency, or under the influence of strong temptation, have wandered from the right way; and to favour all them who mean well and wish to be better, though their meaning and their wishes have not yet fully reformed their lives.

There is likewise danger left, in the pursuit of the power

of godlineſs, too little regard be paid to the form, and left the cenſure of hypocriſy be too haſtily paſſed, and a life apparently regular and ſerious be conſidered as an artifice to conceal bad purpoſes and ſecret views.

That this opinion, which ſome are very willing to indulge, may not prevail ſo as to diſcountenance the profeſſion of piety, we are to conſider,

Thirdly, how far it is neceſſary to the Chriſtian life, that the form and power of godlineſs ſhould ſubſiſt together.

It may be with great reaſon affirmed, that though there may be the appearance of godlineſs without the reality, there can hardly be the reality without the appearance. Part of the duties of a Chriſtian are neceſſarily public. We are to worſhip God in the congregation; we are to make open profeſſion of our hope and faith. One of the great duties of man, as a ſocial being, is, to let his light ſhine before men, to inſtruct by the prevalence of his example, and, as far as his influence extends, to propagate goodneſs and enforce truth. No man is to boaſt of his own excellence, for this reaſon among others; that arrogance will make excellence leſs amiable, and leſs attractive of imitation. No man is to conceal his reverence of religion, or his zeal for truth and right, becauſe, by ſhrinking from the notice of mankind, he betrays diffidence of the cauſe which he wiſhes to maintain. He, whoſe piety begins and ends in zeal for opinions, and in clamour againſt thoſe who differ from him, is certainly yet without the vital energy of religion; but, if his opinions regulate his conduct, he may with great juſtice ſhew his fervour, having already ſhewn his ſincerity. He that worſhips God in public, and offends him by ſecret vices, if he means to make the good part of his conduct balance the bad, is to be cenſured and inſtructed; if he means to gain the applauſe of men, and to make outward ſanctity an inſtrument of miſchief, he is to be deteſted and avoided: but he that really endeavours to obey God in ſecret, neglects part of his duty, if he omits the ſolemnities of public worſhip. The form of godlineſs, as it conſiſts in

the rites of religion, is the instrument given us by God for the acquisition of the power; the means as well as the end are prescribed; nor can he expect the help of grace, or the divine approbation, who seeks them by any other method than that which Infinite Wisdom has condescended to appoint.

SERMON XIV.

ISAIAH, CHAP. xxvi. VER. 3.

Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee, because he trusteth in thee.

IN order to the explication of this text, or the enforcement of the precept implied in it, there seems to be no necessity, either of proving that all men are desirous of happiness, or that their desire, for the most part, fails of being gratified. Every man is conscious that he neither performs nor forbears any thing upon any other motive than the prospect either of an immediate gratification or a distant reward; that whether he complies with temptation, or repels it, he is still influenced by the same general regard to his own felicity; but that when he yields to the solicitation of his appetite, or the impulse of his passions, he is overborne by the prevalence of the object before him; and when he adheres to his duty, in opposition to his present interest, he is influenced by the hopes of future happiness.

That almost every man is disappointed in his search after happiness, is apparent from the clamorous complaints which are always to be heard; from the restless discontent, which is hourly to be observed, and from the incessant pursuit of new objects, which employ almost every moment of every man's life. For a desire of change is a sufficient proof that we are dissatisfied with our present state; and evidently shews that we feel some pain which we desire to avoid, or miss some enjoyment which we wish to possess.

The true cause of this general disgust, an unprejudiced and attentive survey of the world will not long fail of discovering. It will easily appear that men fail to gain what they so much desire, because they seek it where it is not to be found, because they suffer themselves to be dazzled by specious appearances, resign themselves up to the direction of their passions, and, when one pursuit has failed of affording them that satisfaction which they expected from it, apply themselves with the same ardour to another equally unprofitable, and waste their lives in successive delusions, in idle schemes of imaginary enjoyment; in the chace of shadows which fleet before them, and in attempts to grasp a bubble, which, however it may attract the eye by the brightness of its colour, is neither solid nor lasting, but owes its beauty only to its distance, and is no sooner touched than it disappears.

As men differ in age or disposition, they are exposed to different delusions in this important enquiry. The young and the gay imagine happiness to consist in show, in merriment and noise, or in a constant succession of amusements, or in the gratification of their appetites, and the frequent repetition of sensual pleasures. Instead of founding happiness on the solid basis of reason and reflection, they raise an airy fabrick of momentary satisfaction, which is perpetually decaying, and perpetually to be repaired. They please themselves, not with thinking justly, but with avoiding to think at all, with a suspence of all the operations of their intellectual faculties which defends them from remembrance of the past or anticipation of the future. They lull themselves in an enervate and cowardly dissipation, and instead of being happy, are only indolent.

That this state is not a state of happiness, that it affords no real satisfaction to a reasonable mind, those who appear most engaged in it will, in their calmest moments, readily confess. Those among them on whom Providence has bestowed such abilities as are necessary to the discovery of truth, and the distinction of appearance from reality, (for, among the negligent

and voluptuous, men of this character are sometimes to be found,) have always owned, that their felicity is like that of a deep sleep, from which they wake to care and sorrow; or of a pleasing dream, that affords them short gratifications, of which the day deprives them; and that their pleasures only differ from the phantoms of the night in this, that they leave behind them the pangs of guilt, with the vexation of disappointment.

It may be imagined that reasonable beings must quickly discover how little such satisfactions are adapted to their nature, and how necessary it is to change their measures, in order to the attainment of that happiness which they desire; and in effect, it is generally found that few, except the young and unexperienced, content themselves with sensual gratifications, and that men, as they advance in years, and improve their judgment by observation, always confess, by the alteration of their conduct, that mere voluptuousness is not sufficient to fill the desires of the human mind.

They, therefore, shake off the lethargy of sloth, forsake diversion and amusements, and engage in the pursuit of riches or of honours. They employ those hours, which were frequently suffered to pass away unnumbered and unheeded, with the most solicitous application and the most vigilant attention. They are no longer negligent of all that passes about them, no more careless of the opinions of mankind, or unconcerned with regard to censure or applause. They become anxious lest any opportunity should be lost of improving their fortunes, and lest they should give any occasion to reports which may injure their reputation and obstruct their advancement. They constrain their words, their actions and their looks, to obtain popularity, because they consider popularity as necessary to grandeur, and grandeur as the foundation of happiness.

But a very short experience teaches, what might indeed have been without the trial discovered by reflection, that perfect peace, that peace which is so much desired, is not to be found in wealth and greatness. He that succeeds in his first

attempts is animated to new designs; new designs produce new anxieties and new opposition; and though the second attempt should be equally happy, it will be found, as soon as the transports of novelty have ceased, as soon as custom has made elevation familiar, that peace is yet to be sought, and that new measures must be taken for the attainment of that tranquillity, for which it is the nature of man to languish, and the want of which is ill supplied by hurry and confusion, by pomp and variety.

The same disposition which inclines any man to raise himself to a superiority over others, will naturally excite the same desires of greater elevation while he sees any superior to himself. There is, therefore, no hope that, by pursuing greatness, any man can be happy, or, at least, this happiness must be confined to one, because only one can be without a superior; and that one must surely feel his enjoyments very frequently disturbed, when he remembers by how many the station which he possesses is envied and coveted; when he reflects how easily his possessions may be taken from him, perhaps by the same arts by which he attained them; how quickly the affections of the people may, by artful representations of his conduct, be alienated from him; or how easily he may be destroyed by violence, and what numbers ambition or revenge may invite to destroy him.

There is at least one consideration which must embitter the life of him who places his happiness in his present state; a consideration that cannot be suppressed by any artful sophistries which the appetites or the senses are always ready to suggest, and which it might be imagined not always possible to avoid in the most rapid whirl of pleasure, or the most incessant tumults of employment. As it is impossible for any man not to know, it may be well imagined difficult for him not to remember, that, however surrounded by his dependents, however caressed by his patrons, however applauded by his flatterers, or esteemed by his friends, he must one day die; that,

though he should have reason to imagine himself secured from any sudden diminution of his wealth, or any violent precipitation from his rank or power, yet they must soon be taken away by a force not to be resisted or escaped. He cannot but sometimes think, when he surveys his acquisitions, or counts his followers, *that this night his soul may be required of him*, and that he had applauded himself for the attainment of that which he cannot hope to keep long, and which, if it could make him happy while he enjoys it, is yet of very little value, because the enjoyment must be very short.

The story of the great Eastern monarch, who, when he surveyed his innumerable army from an eminence, wept at the reflection, that, in less than a hundred years not one of all that multitude would remain, has been often mentioned, because the particular circumstances in which that remark occurred naturally claim the thought and strike the imagination; but every man that places his happiness in external objects, may every day, with equal propriety, make the same observations. Though he does not lead armies or govern kingdoms, he may reflect, whenever he finds his heart swelling with any present advantage, that he must, in a very short time, lose what he so much esteems; that in a year, a month, a day, or an hour, he may be struck out from the book of life, and placed in a state where wealth or honour shall have no residence, and where all those distinctions shall be forever obliterated, which now engross his thoughts and exalt his pride.

This reflection will surely be sufficient to hinder that peace, which all terrestrial enjoyments can afford, from being perfect. It surely will soon disperse those meteors of happiness that glitter in the eyes only of the thoughtless and supine, and awaken him to a serious and rational enquiry, where real happiness is to be found; by what means man, whom the great Creator cannot be supposed to have formed without the power of obtaining happiness, may set himself free from the shackles of anxiety with which he is incumbered; may throw off the load of terror which oppresses him, and liberate

himself from those horrors which the approach of death perpetually excites.

This he will immediately find only to be accomplished by securing to himself the protection of a Being mighty to save; a Being whose assistance may be extended equally to all parts of his duration, who can equally defend him in the time of danger, and of security; in the tumults of the day, and the privacy of the night; in the time of tribulation, and in a time frequently more fatal, the time of wealth; and in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment. And when he has found the necessity of this sovereign protector, and humbled himself with a due conviction of his own impotence, he may at last find the only comfort which this life can afford him, by remembering, that this great, this unbounded Being has informed us of the terms on which perfect peace is to be obtained, and has promised it to those whose mind is stayed on him.

Since, therefore, the pursuit of perfect peace is the great, the necessary, the inevitable business of human life; since this peace is to be attained by trust in God, and by that only; since, without this, every state is miserable, and the voluptuous and the busy are equally disappointed; what can be more useful than seriously to enquire,

First, What is meant by this trust in God, to which perfect peace is promised? and,

Secondly, By what means this trust in God is to be attained?

First, therefore, let us examine what is meant by this trust in God, to which perfect peace is promised.

Trust, when it is used on common occasions, implies a kind of resignation to the honesty or abilities of another. Thus we trust a physician, when we obey his directions without knowing or asking the particular reasons for the methods which he enjoins. Thus we trust a friend when we commit our affairs to his management, without disturbing ourselves with any care concerning them. Thus we trust a patron, when we serve him with diligence, without any other certain-

He that hopes to find peace by trusting God, must obey him; and when he has at any time failed in his obedience, which amongst the best men will be very frequent, he must endeavour to reconcile God to him by repentance. He may then find another occasion of exercising his trust, by assuring himself, that, *when the wicked forsakes his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and returns unto the Lord, he will have mercy upon him, and abundantly pardon.*

This constant and devout practice is both the effect and cause of confidence in God. He will naturally pour out his supplications to the Supreme Being who trusts in him for assistance and protection; and he who, with proper fervour and humility, prostrates himself before God, will always rise with an increase of holy confidence. By meditating on his own weakness, he will hourly receive new conviction of the necessity of soliciting the favour of his Creator; and by recollecting his promises, will confirm himself in the hope of obtaining what he desires, and if, to secure these promises, he steadily practises the duties on which they depend, he will soon find his mind stayed on God, and be kept in perfect peace, because he trusteth in him.

SERMON XV.

JOB, xiv. 1.

Man that is born of a Woman, is of few days and full of trouble.

THE position, contained in this sentence, neither requires nor admits proof or illustration; being too evident to be denied, and too clear to be mistaken. That life is of short continuance, and is disquieted by many molestations, every man knows and every man feels; and the complaint, attributed to Job, in the history that is supposed to be the oldest book of which mankind is in possession, has been continued and will be continued through all human generations with endless repetitions.

But truth does not always operate in proportion to its reception. What has been always known, and very often said, as it impresses the mind with new images, excites no attention, and is suffered to lie unheeded in the memory. Truth, possest without the labour of investigation, like many of the general conveniences of life, loses its estimation by its easiness of access; nor is it always sufficiently remembered, that the most valuable things are those which are most plentifully bestowed.

To consider the shortness or misery of life, is not an employment to which the mind recurs for solace or diversion; or to which it is invited by any hope of immediate delight. It is one of those intellectual medicines, of which the nauseous essence often obstructs the benefit, and which the fastidiousness of nature prompts us to refuse. But we are told by Solomon that there is *a time not only to laugh*, but *a time to weep*,

and that it is good sometimes *to enter into the house of mourning*. Many things which are not pleasant may be salutary; and among them is the just estimate of human life, which may be made by all with advantage, though by few, very few, with delight. As it is the business of a traveller to view the way before him, whatever dangers may threaten, or difficulties obstruct him, and however void may be the prospect of elegance or pleasure; it is our duty, in the *pilgrimage of life*, to proceed with our eyes open, and to see our state; not as hope or fancy may delineate it, but as it has been in reality appointed by Divine Providence. From errors to which, after most diligent examination, the frailty of our understandings may sometimes expose us, we may reasonably hope that he, who knows whereof we are made, will suffer no irremediable evil to follow; but it would be unreasonable to expect that the same indulgence shall be extended to voluntary ignorance, or that we shall not suffer by those delusions to which we resign ourselves by idleness or choice.

Nothing but daily experience could make it credible that we should see the daily descent into the grave of those whom we love or fear, admire or detest; that we should see one generation past, and another passing, see possessions daily changing their owners, and the world, at very short intervals, altering its appearance, and yet should want to be reminded that life is short; or that we should, wherever we turn our eyes, find misfortune and distress, and have our ears daily filled with the lamentations of misery; that we should often feel pain and sickness, disappointments and privations, and yet, at every respiration of momentary ease, or gleam of fugitive and uncertain joy, be elated beyond the true sense of our condition, and need the voice of salutary admonition to make us remember that life is miserable.

But since the mind is always of itself shrinking from disagreeable images, it is sometimes necessary to recal them; and it may contribute to the repression of many unreasonable desires, and the prevention of many faults and follies, if we frequently and attentively consider,

First, *That man born of a woman is of few days.* And,

Secondly, *That man born of a woman is full of trouble.*

As this changeable and uncertain life is only the passage to an immutable state, and endless duration of happiness or misery; it ought never to be absent from our thoughts, that *man born of a woman is of few days.*

The business of life is to work out our salvation; and the days are few in which provision must be made for eternity. We all stand upon the brink of the grave; of that state in which there is no repentance. He, whose life is extended to its utmost natural boundaries, can live but a little while; and that he shall be one of those, who are comparatively said to live long, no man can tell. Our days are not only few, but uncertain. The utmost that can be hoped, is little; and of that little, the greater part is denied to the majority of mankind.

Our time is short, and our work is great; it is, therefore, with the kindest earnestness enjoined by the apostle, that we use all diligence to make our calling and election sure. But to an impartial surveyor of the ways of men, will it appear that the apostle's summons has been heard or regarded? Let the most candid and charitable observer take cognizance of the general practice of the world, and what can be discovered but gay thoughtlessness, or sordid industry? It seems that to secure their calling and election is the care of few. Of the greater part it may be said that God is not in their thoughts. One forgets him in his business, another in his amusements; one in eager enjoyment of to-day, another in solicitous contrivance for to-morrow. Some die amidst the gratifications of luxury, and some in the tumults of contests undecided, and purposes uncompleted. Warnings are multiplied, but without notice. *Wisdom crieth in the streets*, but is rarely heard.

Among those that live thus wholly occupied by present things, there are some in whom all sense of religion seems extinct or dormant; who acquiesce in their own modes of life,

and never look forward into futurity, but gratify themselves within their own accustomed circle of amusements, or limit their thoughts by the attainment of their present pursuit; and, without suffering themselves to be interrupted by the unwelcome thoughts of death and judgment, congratulate themselves on their prudence or felicity, and rest satisfied with what the world can afford them; not that they doubt, but forget a future state; not that they disbelieve their *own immortality*, but that they never consider it.

To these men it is surely proper to represent the shortness of life, and to remind them that human acquisitions and enjoyments are of few days; and that, whatever value may be assigned them by perverted opinions, they certainly want durability; that the fabric of terrestrial happiness has no foundation that can long support it; that every hour, however enlivened by gaiety, or dignified by splendour, is a part subducted from the sum of life; that age advances alike upon the negligent and anxious; and that every *moment of delight* makes delight the shorter.

If reason forbids us to fix our hearts upon things which we are not certain of retaining, we violate a prohibition still stronger, when we suffer ourselves to place our happiness in that which must certainly be lost; yet such is all that this world affords us. Pleasures and honours must quickly perish, because life itself must soon be at an end.

But if it be folly to delight in advantages of uncertain tenure and short continuance, how great is the folly of preferring them to permanent and perpetual good! The man whose whole attention converges to this world, even if we suppose all his attempts prosperous, and all his wishes granted, gains only empty pleasure, which he cannot keep, at the cost of eternal happiness, which, if now neglected, he can never gain.

Let such men, therefore, seriously reflect, that *man born of a woman is of few days: that he cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down: he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not.*

Others there are on whom the interests of life have very strong hold, who relax their thoughts by pleasure, or enchain them by attention to wealth or power; and yet feel, with forcible conviction, the importance of futurity; in whose breasts pious intentions are often budding, though they are quickly nipped by secular desires. Such men suffer frequent disturbance from the remonstrances of reason and the reproaches of conscience, and do not set reason or conscience at defiance, but endeavour to pacify them with assuasive promises of repentance and amendment. They know that their present state is dangerous, and therefore withdraw from it to a fancied futurity, in which whatever is crooked is to be made straight; in which temptations are to be rejected, and passions to be conquered; in which wisdom and piety are to regulate the day; in which every hour shall have its proper duty. The morning shall awake beneficence, and the evening still the soul in gratitude and devotion.

Purposes like these are often formed, and often forgotten. When remorse and solitude press hard upon the mind, they afford a temporary refuge which, like other shelters from a storm, is forsaken when the calm returns. The design of amendment is never dismissed, but it rests in the bosom without effect. The time convenient for so great a change of conduct is not yet come. There are hindrances which another year will remove; there are helps which some near event will supply. Day rises after day, and one year follows another, and produces nothing but resolutions without effect, and self-reproach without reformation. The time destined for a new life lapses in silence; another time is fixed, and another lapses; but the same train of delusion still continues. He that sees his danger, doubts not his power of escaping it; and, though he has deceived himself a thousand times, loses little of his own confidence. The indignation excited by the past will, he thinks, secure him from any future failure. He retires to confirm his thoughts by meditation, and feels sentiments of piety powerful within him. He ventures again in-

to the ſtream of life, and finds himſelf again carried away by the current.

That, to ſuch men, the ſenſe of their danger may not be uſeleſs; that they may no longer trifle with their own conviction; it is neceſſary to remind them, that *man is of few days*; that the life allotted to human beings is ſhort, and, while they ſtand ſtill in idle ſuſpenſe, is growing always ſhorter; that, as this little time is ſpent well or ill, their whole future exiſtence will be happy or miſerable; that he who begins the great work of his ſalvation early, has employment adequate to all his powers; and that he who has delayed it, can hope to accompliſh it only by delaying it no longer.

To him who turns his thoughts late to the duties of religion, the time is not only ſhorter, but the work is greater. The more ſin has prevailed, with the more difficulty is its dominion reſiſted. Habits are formed by repeated acts, and therefore old habits are always ſtrongeſt. The mode of life to which we have been accuſtomed, and which has entwined itſelf with all our thoughts and actions, is not quitted but with much difficulty. The want of thoſe vanities which have hitherto filled the day, is not eaſily ſupplied. Accuſtomed pleaſures ruſh upon the imagination; the paſſions clamour for their uſual gratifications; and ſin, though reſolutely ſhaken off, will ſtruggle to regain its former hold.

To overcome all theſe difficulties, and overcome they muſt be, who can tell what time will be ſufficient! To diſburthen the conſcience, to reclaim the deſires, to combat ſenſuality, and repreſs vanity, is not the work of an hour or of a day. Many conflicts muſt be endured, many falls recovered, and many temptations repelled. The arts of the enemy muſt be counteracted, and the deceitfulneſs of our own hearts detected by ſteady and perſevering vigilance.

But how much more dreadful does the danger of delay appear, when it is conſidered, that not only life is every day ſhorter, and the work of reformation every day greater, but that ſtrength is every day leſs! It is not only comparatively

lessened by the long continuance of bad habits, but, if the greater part of our time be past, it is absolutely less by natural decay. In the feebleness of declining life, resolution is apt to languish; and the pains, the sickness and consequent infirmities of age, too frequently demand so much care for the body, that very little care is, or can be taken for the soul.

One consideration must be deeply impressed upon every languish and dilatory linger. The penitential sense of sin, and the desire of a new life, when they arise in the mind, are to be received as monitions excited by our merciful Father, as calls which it is our duty to hear, and our interest to follow; that to turn our thoughts away from them is a new sin, a sin which, often repeated, may at last be punished by dereliction. He that has been called often in vain, may be called no more; and when death comes upon him, he will recollect his broken resolves with unutterable anguish; will wish for time to do what he has hitherto neglected, and lament in vain that his days are few.

The motives to religious vigilance and diligence in our duties, which are afforded by serious meditation on the shortness of life, will receive additional force from the view of its misery; and we are therefore to remember,

Secondly, That *man born of a woman is full of trouble.*

The immediate effect of the numerous calamities with which human nature is threatened, or afflicted, is to direct our desires to a better state. When we know that we are on every side beset with dangers; that our condition admits many evils which cannot be remedied, but contains no good which cannot be taken from us; that pain lies in ambush behind pleasure, and misfortune behind success; that we have bodies subject to innumerable maladies, and minds liable to endless perturbations; that our knowledge often gives us pain, by presenting to our wishes such felicity as is beyond our reach, and our ignorance is such that we often pursue, with eagerness, what either we cannot attain, or what, if we could attain it, disappoints our hopes; that in the dead calm of solitude

we are insufficient to our own contentment, and that, when wearinesS of ourselves impels us to society, we are often ill received; when we perceive that small offences may raise enemies, but that great benefits will not always gain us friends; when we find ourselves courted by interest, and forsaken by ingratitude; when those who love us fall daily into the grave, and we see ourselves considered as aliens and strangers by the rising generation; it seems that we must by necessity turn our thoughts to another life, where, to those who are well prepared for their departure, there will no longer be pain or sorrow.

Of the troubles incident to mankind, every one is best acquainted with his own share. The miseries of others may attract, but his own force his attention; and as man is not afflicted but for good purposes, that attention, if well regulated, will contribute to purify his heart.

We are taught in the history of Adam's fall, that trouble was the consequence of sin, and that misery came into the world by disobedience to the divine law. Sin and vexation are still so closely united, that he who traces his troubles to their source will commonly find that his faults have produced them; and he is then to consider his sufferings as the mild admonitions of his heavenly Father, by which he is summoned to timely penitence. He is so far from having any reason to repine, that he may draw comfortable hopes of pardon and acceptance, and may say, with the highest reason, *It is good for me that I have been afflicted.*

It is, however, possible that trouble may, sometimes, be the consequence of virtue. In times of persecution this has often happened. Confessers of the truth have been punished by exile, imprisonment, tortures and death. The faithful have been driven from place to place, and those *have wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, of whom the world was not worthy.* Heb. xi. 37.

Of such violence Providence has now removed us from the danger; but it is still possible that integrity may raise enemies, and that a resolute adherence to the right may not al-

ways be without danger. But evils of this kind bring their consolation with them; and their natural effect is to raise the eye and thoughts to him who certainly judges right; and to excite ardent desires of that state where innocence and happiness shall always be united.

When we have leisure from our own cares to cast our eyes about us, and behold the whole creation groaning in misery, we must be careful that our judgment is not presumptuous, and that our charity is not regulated by external appearances. We are not to consider those on whom evil falls, as the outcasts of Providence; for though temporal prosperity was promised to the Jews, as a reward of faithful adherence to the worship of God; yet under the dispensation of the gospel we are no where taught that the good shall have any exemption from the common accidents of life, or that natural and civil evil shall not be equally shared by the righteous and the wicked.

The frequency of misfortunes, and universality of misery, may properly repress any tendency to discontent or murmur. We suffer only what is suffered by others, and often by those who are better than ourselves.

But the chief reason why we should send out our enquiries to collect intelligence of misery is, that we may find opportunities of doing good. Many human troubles are such as God has given man the power of alleviating. The wants of poverty may evidently be removed by the kindness of those who have more than their own use requires. Of such beneficence the time in which we live does not want examples; and surely that duty can never be neglected to which so great rewards are so explicitly promised.

But the power of doing good is not confined to the wealthy. He that has nothing else to give, may often give advice. Wisdom likewise has benefits in its power. A wise man may reclaim the vicious and instruct the ignorant, may quiet the throbs of sorrow, or disentangle the perplexities of conscience. He may compose the resentful, encourage the timorous, and

animate the hopeless. In the multitudinous affections, with which every state of human life is acquainted, there is place for a thousand offices of tenderness; so that he, whose desire it is to do good, can never be long without an opportunity; and every opportunity that Providence presents, let us seize with eagerness and improve with diligence; remembering that we have no time to lose, for *man that is born of a woman is of few days.*

SERMON XVI.

JOB I. 22.

In all this Job sinned not, nor charged God foolishly.

SUCH is the weakness of human nature, that every particular state, or condition, lies open to particular temptations. Different frames of constitution expose us to different passions of equal danger to our virtue; and different methods of life, whether we engage in them by choice, or are forced upon them by necessity, have each of them their inlets to sin, and their avenues to perdition.

The two opposite states of prosperity and adversity equally require our vigilance and caution; each of them is a state of conflict, in which nothing but unwearied resistance can preserve us from being overcome.

The vices of prosperity are well known, and generally observed. The haughtiness of high rank, the luxury of affluence, and the cruelty of power, every man remarks, and no man palliates. So that they are the common subjects of invective.

But though compassion hinders men from being equally severe upon the faults of the unhappy and distressed, yet, as there always has been, and always will be, at least an equal number in this, as in the other state, it is proper that they likewise should be warned of the crimes to which the circumstances of their condition expose them, and furnished with such reflections as may enable them to avoid them; that one misery may not produce a greater, nor misfortune be the cause of wickedness.

W

There is no crime more incident to those, whose life is embittered with calamities, and whom afflictions have reduced to gloominess and melancholy, than that of repining at the determinations of Providence, or of *charging God foolishly*. They are often tempted to unseemly enquiries into the reason of his dispensations, and to expostulations about the justice of that sentence which condemns them to their present sufferings. They consider the lives of those whom they account happier than themselves, with an eye of malice and suspicion, and if they find them no better than their own, think themselves almost justified in murmuring at their own state.

But how widely they err from their duty, by giving way to discontent, and allowing themselves to dispute the reasonableness of those laws by which the great Creator governs the world, will appear,

First, by considering the attributes of God. And,

Secondly, by reflecting on the ignorance of man.

First, by considering the attributes of God.

Many of the errors of mankind, both in opinion and practice, seem to arise originally from mistaken notions of the Divine Being, or at least from want of attention to the nature of those attributes which reason, as well as the holy scriptures, teaches us to assign to him. A temporary forgetfulness has, for the time, the same effect as real ignorance, but has this advantage, that it is much more easily remedied; since it is much less difficult to recollect our own ideas, than to obtain new ones. This is, I suppose, the state of every man amongst us who is betrayed by his impatience under afflictions to murmur at Heaven. He knows, when he reflects calmly, that the world is neither eternal, nor independent; that we neither were produced, nor are preserved, by chance. But that Heaven and earth, and the whole system of things, were created by an infinite and perfect Being, who still continues to superintend and govern them. He knows that this Great Being is infinitely wise, and infinitely good; so that the end which he proposes must necessarily be the final happiness of

those beings that depend upon him, and the means, by which he promotes that end, must undoubtedly be the wisest and the best. All this he is sufficiently convinced of, when he is awakened to recollection; but his conviction is over-borne by the sudden gusts of passion, and his impatience hurries him to wicked exclamations, before he can recal to his mind those reasonings, which, if attended to, would stifle every rebellious thought, and change his distrust and discontent into confidence and tranquillity.

It very nearly concerns every man, since every man is exposed, by the nature of human things, to trouble and calamities, to provide against the days of adversity, by making such ideas familiar to his mind as may defend him against any temptations to the sin of *charging God foolishly*.

It is frequently observed in common life, that some favourite notion or inclination, long indulged, takes such an entire possession of a man's mind, and so engrosses his faculties, as to mingle thoughts perhaps he is not himself conscious of, with almost all his conceptions, and influence his whole behaviour. It will often operate on occasions with which it could scarcely be imagined to have any connection, and will discover itself, however it may lie concealed, either in trifling incidents, or important occurrences, when it is least expected or foreseen. It gives a particular direction to every sentiment and action, and carries a man forward, as by a kind of resistless impulse, or insuperable destiny.

As this unbounded dominion of ideas, long entertained by the fancy, and naturalized to the mind, is a very strong argument against suffering ourselves to dwell too long upon pleasing dreams, or delightful falsehoods, or admitting any inordinate passion to insinuate itself, and grow domestic; so it is a reason, of equal force, to engage us in a frequent, and intense meditation on those important and eternal rules, which are to regulate our conduct, and rectify our minds; that the power of habit may be added to that of truth, that the most useful ideas may be the most familiar, and that every action of our

lives may be carried on under the superintendence of an overruling piety.

The man who has accustomed himself to consider that he is always in the presence of the Supreme Being, that every work of his hands is carried on, and every imagination of his heart formed, under the inspection of his Creator, and his Judge, easily withstands those temptations which find a ready passage into a mind not guarded and secured by this awful sense of the divine presence.

He is not enticed by ill examples, because the purity of God always occurs to his imagination; he is not betrayed to security by solitude, because he never considers himself as alone.

The two great attributes of our Sovereign Creator, which seem most likely to influence our lives, and, by consequence, most necessarily to claim our attention, are his justice and his mercy. Each of these may suggest considerations very efficacious for the suppression of wicked and unreasonable murmurs.

The justice of God will not suffer him to afflict any man without cause, or without retribution. Whenever we suffer, therefore, we are certain either that we have by our wickedness procured our own miseries, or that they are sent upon us as farther trials of our virtue, in order to prepare us for greater degrees of happiness. Whether we suppose ourselves to suffer for the sake of punishment or probation, it is not easy to discover with what right we repine.

If our pains and labours be only preparatory to unbounded felicity; if we are *persecuted for righteousness sake*, or suffer by any consequences of a good life; we ought to *rejoice and be exceeding glad*, and to glorify the goodness of God, who, by uniting us in our sufferings with saints and martyrs, will join us also in our reward.

But it is not uncharitable to believe of others, that this is not always the reason of their sufferings, and certainly no man ought to believe it of himself, without a very severe and cau-

tious examination, long continued and often repeated; for nothing is more dangerous than spiritual pride. The man that esteems himself a saint will be in danger of relaxing his circumspection, of stopping in his progress of virtue, and, if once he stops, of falling back into those infirmities from which his imaginary exemption made him presumptuous and supine. Every man, therefore, when the hand of God is heavy upon him, must apply himself to an attentive and exact retrospection of his own life. He must enquire, if he has avoided all open enormities and scandalous degrees of guilt; whether he is not punished for some secret crime unknown to the world, and perhaps almost forgotten by himself; whether, in surveying himself, he does not overlook some favourite sin, some criminal indulgence; or whether he has not satisfied himself with increasing his devotions instead of reforming his morals, or whether, from too much confidence in his morality, he has not been negligent of his devotions; and whether he has not contented himself with an imperfect and partial satisfaction for some injury done to his neighbour, when an adequate and complete reparation was in his power.

To this enquiry he will be incited by remembering that God is just, that there is undoubtedly a reason for his misery, which will probably be found in his own corruption. He will, therefore, instead of murmuring at God, begin to examine himself; and when he has found the depravity of his own manners, it is more likely that he will admire the mercy, than complain of the severity of his Judge.

We have indeed so little right to complain of punishment, when it does not exceed the measure of the offence, that to bear it patiently hardly deserves the name of virtue; but impatience under it is, in a high degree, foolish and criminal.

It is well known how partial every man is in his own cause, and therefore it is necessary to meditate much upon the justice of God, lest we be tempted to think our punishments too great for our faults; and, in the midst of our anguish and distress, *charge God foolishly.*

But we shall receive yet farther satisfaction from a frequent reflection on the *mercy* of God. We shall learn to consider him, not only as the Governor, but as the Father of the universe; as a Being infinitely gracious, whose punishments are not inflicted to gratify any passion of anger or revenge, but to awaken us from the lethargy of sin, and to recal us from the paths of destruction.

Every man has observed, that the greatest part of those who enjoy the pleasures of this life, without interruption or restraint, are either entirely forgetful of any other state, or at least very little solicitous about it. Men are easily intoxicated with pleasure, dazzled with magnificence, or elated with power. The most pathetic or rational discourse upon eternity has seldom any lasting effect upon the gay, the young, the wealthy and the prosperous. Even the gospel itself was first received by the poor.

The reason of this is not because religion is best adapted to a gloomy and melancholy state of the mind: for the truths of religion are attested by evidence, which must be yielded to as soon as it is considered, and confirmed by proofs which nothing but inattention can resist. But to consider and weigh this evidence seriously and impartially, the mind must be abstracted, in some measure, from the objects that surround us; objects that strike us strongly, not because they are great, but because they are near, while the views of futurity affect us but faintly, not because they are unimportant, but because they are distant.

A constant conviction of the mercy of God firmly implanted in our minds, will, upon the first attack of any calamity, easily induce us to reflect, that it is permitted by God to fall upon us, lest we should be too much enamoured of our present state, and neglect to extend our prospects into eternity.

Thus, by familiarizing to our minds the attributes of God, shall we, in a great measure, secure ourselves against any temptation to repine at his arrangements; but shall probably still

more strengthen our resolution, and confirm our piety, by reflecting,

Secondly, on the ignorance of man.

One general method of judging and determining upon the value or excellence of things, is by comparing one with another. Thus it is that we form a notion of wealth, greatness of power. It is by comparing ourselves with others that we often make an estimate of our own happiness, and even sometimes of our virtue. They who repine at the ways of Providence, repine often, not because they are miserable, but because they are not so happy as others; and imagine their afflictions dealt with a partial hand, not that they can conceive themselves free from guilt, but because they see, or think they see others equally criminal that suffer less. Should they be supposed to judge rightly of themselves and others, should it be conceived that, in rating their own excellencies, they are not misled by their self-love, or that they are not hindered by envy from discerning the virtues of those whom they look upon as rivals for happiness; yet, unless they could prove that the mercies, which they have received as below their merits, they have no reason to complain. He that has more than he deserves is not to murmur merely because he has less than another.

But when we judge thus confidently of others, we deceive ourselves; we admit conjectures for certainties, and chimeras for realities. To determine the degrees of virtue and wickedness in particular men, is the prerogative only of that Being that searches the secrets of the heart, that knows what temptations each man has resisted; how far the means of grace have been afforded him, and how he has improved or neglected them; that sees the force of every passion, knows the power of every prejudice, attends to every conflict of the mind, and marks all the struggles of imperfect virtue. He only, who gave us our faculties and abilities, knows when we err by insurmountable ignorance, or when we deviate from the right by negligence or presumption. He only, that knows every cir-

cumstance of life, and every motion of the mind, can tell how far the crimes or virtues of each man are to be punished or rewarded. No man can say that he is better than another, because no man can tell how far the other was enabled to resist temptation, or what incidents might concur to overthrow his virtue. Nor are we able to decide, with much greater certainty, upon the happiness of others. We see only the superficies of men, without knowing what passes within. Splendour, equipage and luxury are not always accompanied by happiness; but are more frequently the wretched solaces of a mind distracted with perplexities and harassed with terrors. Men are often driven, by reflection and remorse, into the hurries of business or of pleasure, and fly from the terrifying suggestions of their own thoughts to banquets and to courts.

Prosperity and happiness are very different, though by those who undertake to judge of the state of others they are always confounded. It is possible to know that another is prosperous, that his revenues increase, that his dependants grow more numerous, that his schemes succeed and his reputation advances. But we cannot tell how much all these promote his happiness, because we cannot judge how much they may engage his care or inflame his desires; how much he may fear his enemies or suspect his friends. We know not how much this seeming felicity may be impaired by his folly or his guilt; and therefore he that murmurs at the inequality of human happiness, or accuses Providence of partiality, forgets his own imperfections, and determines rashly where he cannot judge.

Let every one, then, whom God shall visit with affliction, humble himself before him, with steady confidence in his mercy, and unfeigned submission to his justice. Let him remember that his sins are the cause of his miseries, that his troubles are sent to awaken him to reflection, and that the evils of this life may be improved to his eternal advantage, if, instead of adding sin to sin, and *charging God foolishly*, he applies himself seriously to the great work of self-examination and repentance,

For ſurely the frailty of this life, and the uncertainty of all human happineſs, is proved by every view of the world about us, and every reflection upon ourſelves. Let not death arreſt us in a ſtate of mind unfit to ſtand the trial of eternal juſtice, or to obtain the privileges of infinite mercy! Let it not ſurpriſe us engaged in ſchemes of vanity, or wiſhes of empty pleaſure! Let death, which may ſeize us now, which will ſeize us at ſome time, equally terrible, find us, whenever it ſhall come, animated with the love of God, ſubmiſſive to his eternal will, and diffuſed in univerſal charity and benevolence to our brethren.

Let this inſtant begin a new life, and every future minute improve it! Then, in exchange for riches, honours, or ſenſual delights, we may obtain the tranquillity of a good conſcience, and that *peace of God which paſſeth all underſtanding.*

SERMON XVII.

EXODUS, XX. 16.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

NOTHING is more common than for men to make partial and absurd distinctions between vices of equal enormity, and to observe some of the divine commands with great scrupulousness; while they violate others, equally important, without any concern, or the least apparent consciousness of guilt.

That to do our duty in part is better than entirely to disregard it, cannot be denied; and he that avoids some crimes, from the fear of displeasing God, is doubtless far more innocent than he who has thrown off all restraint, has forgotten the distinctions of good and evil, and complies with every temptation. But it is a very dangerous mistake to conceive that any man, by obeying one law, acquires the liberty of breaking another; or that all sins, equally odious to God, or hurtful to men, are not, with equal care, to be avoided.

We may frequently observe that men, who would abhor the thought of violating the property of another by direct methods of oppression or rapine, men, on all common occasions not only just, but kind and compassionate, willing to relieve the necessitous, and active in the protection of the injured, will, nevertheless, invade the characters of others with defamation and calumny, and destroy a reputation without remorse.

If every day did not convince us how little either good or bad men are consistent with themselves, it might be wondered how men, who own their obligations to the practice of some

duties, can overlook in themselves the omission of others equally important, and enjoined by the same authority; and that those who avoid *theft*, because they are forbidden *to steal*, do not equally abstain from *calumny*, since they are no less forbidden *to bear false witness against their neighbour*: a prohibition, of which I shall endeavour to explain the nature, and enforce the necessity, by shewing,

First, What are the different senses in which a man may be said *to bear false witness against his neighbour*.

Secondly, The enormity of the sin of *bearing false witness*.

Thirdly, What reflections may best enable us to avoid it.

The highest degree of guilt forbidden by this law of God, is false testimony in a literal sense, or deliberate and solemn perjury in a court of justice, by which the life of an innocent man is taken away, the rightful owner stripped of his possessions, or an oppressor supported in his usurpations. This is a crime that includes robbery and murder, sublimed to the highest state of enormity, and heightened with the most atrocious aggravations. He that robs or murders by this method, not only does it by the nature of the action, with calmness and premeditation, but by making the name of God a sanction to his wickedness. Upon this it is unnecessary to dwell long, since men, arrived to this height of corruption, are scarcely to be reformed by argument or persuasion; and indeed seldom suffer themselves to be reasoned with or admonished. It may be, however, proper to observe, that he who is ever so remotely the cause of any wickedness, if he really designs and willingly promotes it, is guilty of that action in the same, or nearly the same degree with the immediate perpetrator; and therefore he that suborns a false witness, or procures such a one to be suborned, whether in his own cause or in that of another, is guilty of the crime of perjury in its utmost extent.

Nor is that man only perjured who delivers for truth what he certainly knows to be false; but he likewise that asserts what he does not know to be true. For as an oath taken implies, in the opinion of the magistrate who administers it, a

knowledge of the fact required to be proved, he that, by offering himself as an evidence, declares himself acquainted with what he is ignorant of, is guilty of bearing false witness, since, though what he swears should happen to be true, it is not true that he knew it.

Such remarks as these seem, at the first view, very trifling, because they are obvious, and yet are made necessary by the conduct of mankind. Every man, almost, has had opportunities of observing with what gross and artless delusions men impose upon themselves; how readily they distinguish between actions, in the eye of justice and of reason, equally criminal; how often they hope to elude the vengeance of heaven, by substituting others to perpetrate the villanies they contrive; how often they mock God by groundless excuses, and how often they voluntarily shut their eyes to leap into destruction.

There is another sense in which a man may be *said to bear false witness against his neighbour*, a lower degree of the crime forbidden in the text, a degree in which multitudes are guilty of it; or, rather, from which scarcely any are entirely free. He that attacks the reputation of another by calumny is, doubtless, according to the malignity of the report, chargeable with the breach of this commandment.

Yet this is so universal a practice, that it is scarcely accounted criminal, or numbered among those sins which require repentance. Defamation is become one of the amusements of life, a cursory part of conversation and social entertainment. Men sport away the reputation of others, without the least reflection upon the injury which they are doing, and applaud the happiness of their own invention, if they can increase the mirth of a feast, or animate conviviality, by slander and detraction.

How it comes to pass that men do not perceive the absurdity of distinguishing in such a manner between themselves and others, as to conceive that conduct innocent in themselves which in others they would make no difficulty of condemn-

ing, it is not easy to tell. Yet it is apparent that every man is sufficiently sensible, when his own character is attacked, of the cruelty and injustice of calumny; and it is not less evident that those will animadvert, with all the wantonness of malice, upon the moral irregularities of others, whom the least reflection upon their own lives kindles into fury, and exasperates to the utmost severities of revenge.

To invent a defamatory falsehood, to rack the invention for the sake of disguising it with circumstances of probability, and propagate it industriously, till it becomes popular and takes root in the minds of men, is such a continued act of malice as nothing can palliate.

Nor will it be a sufficient vindication to allege that the report, though not wholly, yet in part is true, and that it was no unreasonable suspicion that suggested the rest. For, if suspicion be admitted for certainty, every man's happiness must be entirely in the power of those bad men, whose consciousness of guilt makes them easily judge ill of others, or whom a natural or habitual jealousy inclines to imagine frauds or villanies where none are intended. And if small failings may be aggravated at the pleasure of the relator, who may not, however cautious, be made infamous and detestable? A calumny, in which falsehood is complicated with truth, and malice is assisted by probability, is more dangerous, but therefore less innocent, than unmixed forgery and groundless invectives.

Neither is the first author only of a calumny a *false witness against his neighbour*, but he likewise that disseminates and promotes it; since without his assistance it would perish as soon as it is produced, would evaporate in the air without effect, and hurt none but him that uttered it. He that blows a fire for the destruction of a city, is no less an incendiary than he that kindled it. And the man that imagines he may, without a crime, circulate a calumny which he has received from another, may, with equal reason, conceive that, tho' it be murder to prepare poisons, it may be innocent to disperse them.

Many are the pleas and excuſes with which thoſe, who cannot deny this practice, endeavour to palliate it. They frequently aſſert, in their own juſtification, that they do not know the relation, which they hand about, to be falſe. But to thoſe it may be juſtly replied, that before they ſpread a report to the prejudice of others, they ought, if not to know that it is true, at leaſt to believe it upon ſome reaſonable grounds. They ought not to aſſiſt a random *whiſper, or drive* forward a flying tale; they ought not eagerly to catch at an opportunity of hurting, or add weight to a blow which may perhaps be undeſerved.

It may happen indeed, that a calumny may be ſupported by ſuch teſtimony, and connected with ſuch probabilities, as may deceive the circumſpect and juſt; and the reporter, in ſuch caſes, is by no means to be charged with bearing falſe witneſs; becauſe to believe and diſbelieve is not *in our power*; for there is a certain degree of evidence, *to which a man* cannot but yield. He, therefore, *who is deceived himſelf*, cannot be accuſed of deceiving others, and is only ſo far blameable, as he contributed to the diſhonour or prejudice of another, by ſpreading his faults without any juſt occaſion, or lawful cauſe. For to relate reproachful truths, only for the pleaſure of depreſſing the reputation of our neighbour, is far from being innocent. The crime indeed doth not fall under the head of calumny, but only differs from it in the falſehood, not in the malice.

There is another occaſion made uſe of, by which, if this fault could eſcape from cenſure, many others might enjoy the ſame advantage. It is urged by ſome, that they do not adopt the tale, till it is generally received, and only promote what they cannot hinder. But how muſt wickedneſs be controuled, if its prevalence be a reaſon for compliance? Is it equitable and juſt to coaleſce with oppreſſors, becauſe they are already too powerful for the injured to reſiſt? Thus any man might vindicate rebellion, by affirming that he did not join with the rebels, till they were already numerous enough to

dethrone their prince. Thus a man may exempt himself from blame, for betraying his trust, and selling his country, by alleging that others had already sold it, and he only entered into the combination, that he might share the reward of perfidy. But it requires few arguments to shew the folly of such pleas as these. It is the duty of every man to regulate his conduct, not by the example of others, or by his own surmises, but by the invariable rules of equity and truth. Wickedness must be opposed by some, or virtue would be entirely driven out of the world. And who must oppose it in extremities, if, as it increases more, it be less criminal to yield without resistance? If this excuse will vindicate one man, it will vindicate another; and no man will be found, who is obliged to maintain a post, from which others may fly without a crime, and to endeavour to reform the world, by which it is no reproach to be vitiated. If this reasoning were just, there might be a state of general depravity, in which wickedness might lose its guilt, since every man might be led away by predominant corruption, and the universality of vice become its own defence.

In such a situation indeed, there is a necessity for an uncommon firmness and resolution to persist in the right, without regard to ridicule on the one hand, or interest on the other. But this resolution must be summoned; we must call up all our strength, and awaken all our caution, and, in defiance of iniquity, however warranted by fashion, or supported by power, maintain an unshaken integrity, and reproach the world by a good example, if we cannot amend it.

There is yet another way, by which we may partake, in some measure, of the sin of *bearing false witness*. That he, who does not hinder the commission of a crime, involves himself in the guilt, cannot be denied; and that his guilt is yet more flagrant, if, instead of obstructing, he encourages it, is equally evident. He therefore that receives a calumny with applause, or listens to it with a silent approbation, must

be at least chargeable with conniving at wrong, which will be found no trivial accusation, when we have considered,

Secondly, the enormity of the sin of *bearing false witness*.

The malignity of an offence arises, either from the motives that prompted it, or the consequences produced by it.

If we examine the sin of calumny by this rule, we shall find both the motives and consequences of the worst kind. We shall find its causes and effects concurring to distinguish it from common wickedness, and rank it with those crimes that pollute the earth, and blacken human nature.

The most usual incitement to defamation is envy, or impatience of the merit or success of others; a malice raised not by any injury received, but merely by the sight of that happiness which we cannot attain. This is a passion, of all others most hurtful and contemptible; it is pride complicated with lazinesS; pride which inclines us to wish ourselves upon the level with others, and lazinesS which hinders us from pursuing our inclinations with vigour and assiduity. Nothing then remains but that the envious man endeavour to stop those, by some artifice, whom he will not strive to overtake, and reduce his superiors to his own meanness, since he cannot rise to their elevation. To this end he examines their conduct with a resolution to condemn it; and, if he can find no remarkable defects, makes no scruple to aggravate smaller errors, till, by adding one vice to another, and detracting from their virtues by degrees, he has divested them of that reputation which obscured his own, and left them no qualities to be admired or rewarded.

Calumnies are sometimes the offspring of resentment. When a man is opposed in a design which he cannot justify, and defeated in the prosecution of schemes of tyranny, extortion, or oppression, he seldom fails to revenge his overthrow by blackening that integrity which effected it. No rage is more fierce than that of a villain disappointed of those advantages which he has pursued by a long train of wickedness. He has forfeited the esteem of mankind, he has burthened his

conſcience, and hazarded his future happineſs, to no purpoſe, and has now nothing to hope but the ſatisfaction of involving thoſe, who have broken his meaſures, in misfortunes and diſgrace. By wretches like theſe it is no wonder if the vileſt arts of detraction are practiſed without ſcruple, ſince both their reſentment and their intereſt direct them to depreſs thoſe, whoſe influence and authority will be employed againſt them.

But what can be ſaid of thoſe who, without being impelled by any violence of paſſion, without having received any injury or provocation, and without any motives of intereſt, vilify the deſerving and the worthleſs without diſtinction; and, merely to gratify the levity of temper and incontinence of tongue, throw out aſperſions equally dangerous with thoſe of virulence and enmity?

Theſe always reckon themſelves, and are commonly reckoned by thoſe whoſe gaiety they promote, among the benevolent, the candid, and the humane; men without gall or malignity, friends to good humour, and lovers of a jeſt. But, upon a more ſerious eſtimation, will they not be, with far greater propriety, claſſed with the cruel and the ſelfiſh wretches that feel no anguiſh at ſacrificing the happineſs of mankind to the loweſt views, to the poor ambition of excelling in ſcurrility? To deſerve the exalted character of humanity and good-nature, a man muſt mean *well*; it is not ſufficient to mean *nothing*. He muſt act and think with generous views, not with a total diſregard of all the conſequences of his behaviour. Otherwiſe, with all his wit and all his laughter, what character can he deſerve, but that of *the fool, who ſcatters fire-brands, arrows, and death, and ſays, am I not in ſport?*

The conſequences of this crime, whatever be the inducements to commit it, are equally pernicious. He that attacks the reputation of another, invades the moſt valuable part of his property, and perhaps the only part which he can call his

own. Calumny can take away what is out of the reach of tyranny and usurpation, and what may enable the sufferer to repair the injuries received from the hand of oppression. The persecutions of power may injure the fortune of a good man; but those of calumny must complete his ruin.

Nothing can so much obstruct the progress of virtue, as the defamation of those that excel in it. For praise is one motive, even in the best minds, to superior and distinguishing degrees of goodness; and therefore he that reduces all men to the same state of infamy, at least deprives them of one reward which is due to merit, and takes away one incitement to it. But the effect does not terminate here. Calumny destroys that influence, and power of example, which operates much more forcibly upon the minds of men, than the solemnity of laws, or the fear of punishment. Our natural and real power is very small; and it is by the ascendant which he has gained, and the esteem in which he is held, that any man is able to govern others, to maintain order in society, or to perform any important service to mankind, to which the united endeavours of numbers are required. This ascendant, which, when conferred upon bad men by superiority of riches, or hereditary honour, is frequently made use of to corrupt and deprave the world, to justify debauchery and shelter villany, might be employed, if it were to be obtained only by desert, to the noblest purposes. It might discountenance vanity and folly; it might make the fashion co-operate with the laws, and reform those upon whom reason and conviction have no force.

Calumny differs from most other injuries in this dreadful circumstance: He who commits it never can repair it. A false report may spread where a recantation never reaches; and an accusation must certainly fly faster than a defence, while the greater part of mankind are base and wicked. The effects of a false report cannot be determined or circumscribed. It may check a hero in his attempts for the promotion of the happiness of his country, or a saint in his endeavours for the propagation of truth.

Since, therefore, this sin is so destructive to mankind, and, by consequence, so detestable in the sight of God, it is necessary that we enquire,

Thirdly, What reflections may best enable us to avoid it.

The way to avoid effects is to avoid the causes. Whoever, therefore, would not be tempted *to bear false witness*, must endeavour to suppress those passions which may incite him to it. Let the envious man consider that, by detracting from the character of others, he in reality adds nothing to his own; and the malicious man, that nothing is more inconsistent with every law of God, and institution of men, than implacability and revenge.

If men would spend more time in examining their own lives and inspecting their own characters, they would have less leisure and less inclination to remark with severity upon others. They would easily discover that it will not be for their advantage to exasperate their neighbour, and that a scandalous falsehood may be easily revenged by a reproachful truth.

It was determined by our blessed Saviour, in a case of open and uncontested guilt, that *he who was without fault* should *cast the first stone*. This seems intended to teach us compassion even to the failings of bad men; and certainly that religion which extends so much indulgence to the bad as to restrain us from the utmost rigour of punishment, cannot be doubted to require that the good should be exempted from calumny and reproach.

Let it be always remembered that charity is the height of religious excellence; and that it is one of the characteristics of this virtue, that it *thinketh no ill of others*.

SERMON XVIII.

[PREACHED AT ASHBOURN.]

1 CORINTHIANS, vi. 8.

Nay, you do wrong and defraud, and that your brethren.

TO subdue passion and regulate desire, is the great task of man as a moral agent; a task, for which natural reason, however assisted and enforced by human laws, has been found insufficient, and which cannot be performed but by the help of religion.

The passions are divided by moralists into irascible and concupiscible; the passions of resentment and the passions of desire. The danger of the irascible passions, the mischiefs of anger, envy and revenge, every man knows, by evil which he has felt or evil which he has perpetrated. In their lower degrees, they produce brutality, outrage, contumely and calumny; and, when they are inflamed to the utmost, have too often risen to violence and bloodshed.

Of these passions, the mischief is sometimes great, but not very frequent; for we are taught to watch and oppose them from our earliest years. Their malignity is universally known and as universally dreaded. The occasions that can raise them high do not often occur; and when they are raised, if there be no immediate opportunity of gratifying them, they yield to reason and persuasion, or subside by the soothing influence of time.

Of the irascible passions, the direct aim and present purpose is, the hurt or misery of another; of the concupiscible

paſſions, the proper motive is our own good. It is therefore no reproach to human nature that the concupiſcible paſſions are more prevalent; for, as it is more natural, it is more juſt to deſire our own good than another's evil.

The deſire of happineſs is inſeparable from a rational being acquainted, by experience, with the various gradations of pain and pleaſure. The knowledge of different degrees of happineſs ſeems neceſſary to the excitement of deſire and the ſtimulation of activity. He that had never felt pain would not fear it, nor uſe any precaution to prevent it. He who had been always equally at eaſe, would not know that his condition admitted any improvement, and therefore could have no end to purſue, or purpoſe to proſecute. But man, in his preſent ſtate, knowing of how much good he is capable, and to how many evils he is expoſed, has his mind perpetually employed, in defence, or in acquiſition, in ſecuring that which he has, or attaining that which he believes he either does or ſhall want.

He that deſires happineſs muſt neceſſarily deſire the means of happineſs, muſt wiſh to appropriate and accumulate whatever may ſatisfy his deſires. It is not ſufficient to be without want. He will try to place himſelf beyond the fear of want, and endeavour to provide future gratifications for future wiſhes, and lay up in ſtore future proviſions for future neceſſities.

It is by the effect of this care to provide againſt the evils, and to attain the bleſſings of life, that human ſociety has its preſent form. For this purpoſe profeſſions are ſtudied, and trades learned; dangers are encountered, and labour endured. For this reaſon every man educates his ſon in ſome uſeful art, which, by making him neceſſary to others, may oblige others to repay him what is neceſſary to himſelf. The general employment of mankind is to encreaſe pleaſure, or remove the preſſure of pain. Theſe are the vital principles of action, that fill ports with ſhips, ſhops with manufactures, and fields with huſbandmen; that keep the ſtateſman diligent in attendance, and the trader active in his buſineſs.

It is apparently the opinion of the civilized world, that he who would be happy muſt be rich. In riches the goods of life are compendiouſly contained. They do not enlarge our own perſonal powers; but they enable us to employ the powers of others for our advantage. He who cannot make what he wants, will however eaſily procure it, if he can pay an artiſt. He who ſuffers any remediable inconvenience, needs not to ſuffer it long, if he can reward the labour of thoſe who are able to remove it. Riches will make an ignorant man prudent by another's wiſdom, and a weak man vigorous by another's ſtrength. It can, therefore, be no wonder, that riches are generally deſired; and that almoſt every man is buſy, through his whole life, in gaining, or in keeping them, for himſelf, or his poſterity.

As there is no deſire ſo extenſive, or ſo continual in its exertions, that poſſeſſes ſo many minds, or operates with ſuch reſtleſs activity; there is none that deviates into greater irregularity, or more frequently corrupts the heart of man, than the wiſh to enlarge poſſeſſion and accumulate wealth.

In a diſcourſe, intended for popular inſtruction, it would be of little utility to mention the ambition of Kings, and diſplay the cruelty of conquerors. To ſlaughter thouſands in a day, to ſpread deſolation over wide and fertile regions, and to carry rapine and deſtruction indiſcriminately from one country to another, can be the crime only of thoſe few who have ſceptres in their hands; and, even among them, the wantonneſs of war is not very common in our days. But it is a ſufficient evidence of the power of intereſt, that ſuch acts ſhould ever have been perpetrated; that there could ever be any man, willing to augment his wealth, or extend his power, by ſlaughter and devaſtation; or able to perſuade himſelf, that he might purchaſe advantages, which he could enjoy only in imagination, at the expenſe of the lives of thouſands of his ſubjects, as well as his adverſaries; of adverſaries that never had injured, or offended him, and of ſubjects whom it was his duty and his engagement to preſerve and to protect.

Nor is it neceſſary to mention crimes, which are commonly found amongſt the loweſt of mankind, the crimes of robbery and theft. For, though they are too common, their enormity is ſufficiently underſtood by the laws which are enacted againſt them, and ſufficiently menaced by the terrors which thoſe laws hold out. They are ſo apparently deſtructive of ſocial ſecurity, their conſequences are ſo eaſily perceived, and their perniciouſneſs ſo generally acknowledged, that to be ſuſpected of them is to be infamous; and to be detected in the commiſſion of them is to be expoſed to puniſhment, and often to death.

But there is another mode of injuring the property of others, and of gaining unjuſt advantages, which, though not equally liable, at all times, to puniſhment, with theft and robbery, is, in its own nature, equally criminal, and perhaps more pernicious; therefore, equally open to the cenſures of reaſon and religion. This ſpecies of guilt is diſtinguiſhed by the appellation of *fraud*; a word which, when uttered, really excites a due degree of deteſtation, and which thoſe, who practiſe it, perhaps diſguiſe to their conſciences by ſtill ſofter terms.

But that ſuch diſguiſes may deceive the ſoul no longer; and that what is univerſally miſchievous may be totally abhorred; I ſhall endeavour to ſhew,

Firſt, The nature of *fraud*, and the temptations to practiſe it.

Secondly, How much it is contrary to the rules of religion, and how much it obſtructs the happineſs of the world.

The nature of fraud, as diſtinct from other violations of right or property, ſeems to conſiſt in this, that the man injured is induced to concur in the act by which the injury is done. Thus, to take away any thing valuable, without the owner's knowledge, is a *theft*; to take it away, againſt his conſent, by threats or force, is a *robbery*; to borrow it, without intention of returning it, is a *fraud*, becauſe the owner conſents to the act, by which it paſſed out of his own hands.

All *fraud*, therefore, supposes deceit, either in the affirmation of what is false, or the suppression of what is true; for no man willingly wrongs himself. He must be deceived, either by false appearances of the present, or by false promises of the future, by a display of fictitious advantages, or an artful concealment of certain inconveniences.

As it often happens, that in committing a *fraud*, or persuading a man to injure himself, a considerable degree of skill and dexterity is required; the fraudulent are often considered, by themselves and others, as possessing uncommon powers of understanding, so that, though the act itself is blamed, the artifice is admired. Conscience is overpowered by vanity, and the shame of guilt is lost in the pride of subtility and acuteness.

It is to be feared that the science of over-reaching is too closely connected with lucrative commerce. There are classes of men who do little less than profess it, and who are scarcely ashamed, when they are detected in imposture. Such men live indeed without reputation. They are considered as exercising dishonourable employments, but they are still tolerated; and, however they may be despised, are very rarely punished. The whole practice of buying and selling is indeed replete with temptation, which even a virtuous mind finds it difficult to resist. **A merchant shall hardly keep himself from doing wrong, and an huckster shall not be freed from sin.*

† Many have sinned for a small matter: and he that seeketh for abundance, will turn his eyes away. As a nail sticketh fast between the joinings of the stones, so doth sin stick close between buying and selling.

Such is the censure of the Son of Sirach, which surely cannot be heard without alarm and terror.

It is, however, by no means to be admitted, that all trade is necessarily fraudulent, or that all traders are dishonest. Ev-

* Ecclesiasticus, xxvi. 29. † Ecclesiasticus, xxvii. 1, 2.

ery kind of life has its peculiar dangers, which the negligent incur, and the wise escape. The danger of a trader, like that of others, may be avoided by resolution, vigilance, and prayer, by a constant reference of his actions to his eternal interest, and by the help of God, diligently implored.

That the necessity of this vigilance may be more strongly recommended, it is fit that we consider,

Secondly, How much the practice of *fraud* is contrary to religion, and how much it obstructs the happiness of the world.

The great rule, by which religion regulates all transactions between one man and another, is, that every man *should do to others what he would expect that others*, in the same case, *should do to him*. This rule is violated in every act of fraud. For, however the *children of the world* may forgive, or applaud, themselves, when they *practise fraud*, they complain very loudly when they *suffer* it. They then can clearly discern its baseness and its mischief, and discover that nothing deserves praise but purity and goodness.

The crime of *fraud* has this aggravation, that it is generally an abuse of confidence. Robberies of violence are committed commonly upon those to whom the robber is unknown. The lurking thief takes indiscriminately what comes by chance within his reach. But deceit cannot be practised, unless by some previous treaty, and gradual advance, by which distrust is dissipated, and an opinion of candour and integrity excited. *Fraud*, therefore, necessarily disguises life with solicitude and suspicion. He that has been deceived, knows not afterwards whom he can trust, but grows timorous, reserved, afraid alike of enemies and friends; and loses, at least, part of that benevolence which is necessary to an amiable and virtuous character.

Fraud is the more to be suppressed by universal detestation, as its effects can scarcely be limited. A thief seldom takes away what can much impoverish the loser; but by

fraud, the opulent may at once be reduced to indigence, and the prosperous distressed; the effects of a long course of industry may be suddenly annihilated, the provision made for age may be withdrawn, and the inheritance of posterity intercepted.

For the particular application of this doctrine, I am sorry that my native place should afford an opportunity. But since this society has called me to stand here before them, I hope no man will be offended that I do my duty with fidelity and freedom. Truth requires that I warn you against a species of fraud, sometimes found amongst you, and that of a very shameful and oppressive kind. When any man, whose contributions have had their due part in raising the fund for occasional relief, is reduced by disease or hurt, to want the support which he has, perhaps, for many years supposed himself gradually accumulating against the day of distress; and for which he has denied himself many gratifications; at the time when he expects the beneficial effects of his *prudence and parsimony*; at that very time, every artifice is used to defeat his claim, and elude his right. He declares himself, perhaps, unable to work, by which nothing more can reasonably be meant than that he is no longer capable of labour equal to his livelihood. This man is found employing the remains of his strength in some little office. For this surely he deserves to be commended. But what has been the consequence? He has been considered as an impostor, who claims the benefit of the fund by counterfeited incapacity; and that feeble diligence, which, among reasonable and equitable men, gives him a title to esteem and pity, is misapplied, and misrepresented into a pretence for depriving him of his right, and this done by judges who vainly imagine they shall be benefited themselves by their own wicked determination.

It is always to be remembered, that a demand of support from your common fund is not a petition for charity, but a claim to justice. The relief thus demanded is not a gift, but a debt. He that receives it has first purchased it. The denial

of it, therefore, is a fraud and a robbery; and fraud so much the more atrocious and detestable as, by its nature, it must always be practised on the poor. When this succour is required, there is no place for favour or for resentment. What is due must be paid, because it is due. Other considerations have here no weight. The amiable and the perverse, the good and the bad, have an equal right to the performance of their contract. He that has trusted the society with his money, cannot, without breach of faith, be denied that payment which, when he payed his contribution, was solemnly stipulated.

It has been always observed by the wise, that it is every man's real interest to be honest; and he who practises *fraud*, to the injury of others, shews, at the same time, how *fraud* may be practised against himself. Those who have been forward in watching the steps of others, and have objected to payment when it was required, may live to be themselves watched, and excluded by a precedent which their own fraudulence or malice has incited them to establish. They will then feel the folly of wickedness, and know the necessity of providing against the day of calamity by innocence and integrity; they will wish that they could claim the kindness of others, as a recompense for kindness formerly exhibited by themselves.

Fraud is the more hurtful, because the wrong is often without redress. As he that is wronged by fraudulent practices must always concur in the act that injured him; it is not always easy to ascertain the exact limits of his agency, so as to know precisely how far he was deceived. This, at least, is seldom to be done without an enquiry and discussion, liable to many legal delays, and eludible by many artifices. The redress, therefore, is often more pernicious than the injury; and while the robber lurks in secret, or flies for his life, the man of *fraud* holds up his head with confidence, enjoys the fruits of his iniquity with security, and bids defiance to detection and to punishment.

But this triumph, however he may escape human judicatures, must end with his life. The time will come, and will come quickly, when he that has defrauded his neighbour must stand before the Judge of all the earth, a Judge whom he cannot deceive; and before whom, whatever he has taken wrongfully, without restitution, and without repentance, will lie heavy on his soul.

Let him, therefore, that has stolen, steal no more! Let him who has gained by *fraud*, repent and restore, and live and die in the exercise of honesty!

SERMON XIX.

2 CORINTHIANS, IX. 7.

Every man according as he purpoſeth in his heart ſo let him give, not grudgingly, or of neceſſity, for God loveth a cheerful giver.

THE frequency with which the duty of alms-giving has of late been recommended; the perſpicuity with which it has, on many occaſions, been explained; the force of argument by which its neceſſity has been proved to the reaſon, and the ardour of zeal with which it has been impreſſed upon the paſſions, make it reaſonable to believe that it is now generally underſtood, and that very few of thoſe who frequent the public worſhip, and attend with proper diligence to inſtruction, can receive much information with regard to the excellence and importance of this virtue.

But as moſt of the crimes and miſeries of our lives ariſe rather from negligence than ignorance; as thoſe obligations which are beſt known are ſometimes, from the ſecurity to which the conſciouſneſs of our knowledge naturally betrays us, moſt eaſily forgotten; and as the impreſſions which are made upon the heart, however ſtrong or durable they may at firſt appear, are eaſily weakened by time, and effaced by the perpetual ſucceſſion of other objects, which crowd the memory and diſtract the attention; it is neceſſary that this great duty ſhould be frequently explained, that our ardour ſhould be rekindled by new motion, our conviction awakened by new perſuaſions, and our minds enlightened by frequent repetitions

of the instructions which, if not recollected, must quickly lose their effect.

Every man who has either applied himself to the examination of his own conduct with care proportioned to the importance of the enquiry, or indulged himself in the more frequent employment of inspecting the behaviour of others, has had many opportunities of observing with how much difficulty the precepts of religion are long preserved *in their full force*; how insensibly the ways of virtue are forsaken, and into what depravity those, who trust too much to their own strength, sometimes fall, by neglecting to press forward, and to confirm their resolution by the same methods as they at first excited it. Innumerable temptations continually surround us, and innumerable obstructions oppose us. We are lulled with indolence, we are seduced by pleasure, we are perverted by bad examples, and we are betrayed by our own hearts. No sooner do we, in compliance either with the vanities or the business of life, relax our attention to the doctrines of piety, than we grow cold and indifferent, dilatory and negligent. When we are again called to our duty, we find our minds entangled with a thousand objections; we are ready to plead every avocation, however trifling, as an exemption from the necessity of holy practices; and, because we readily satisfy *ourselves* with our excuses, we are willing to imagine that we shall satisfy God, the God of infinite holiness and justice, who sees the most secret motions of our minds, who penetrates through all our hypocrisy, and upon whom disinclination can be never imposed for inability.

With regard to the duty of charity, it is too common for men, of avaricious and worldly dispositions, to imagine that they may be saved without compliance with a command so little agreeable to their inclinations; and therefore, though perhaps they cannot always resist the force of argument, or repel conviction at its first assault, yet, as they do not willingly suffer their minds to dwell upon reasonings which they scarcely wish to be true, or renew, by frequent recollection, that

ſenſe of their duty which they have received, they quickly relapſe into their former ſordid inſenſibility, and, by indulging every conſideration which can be applied to the juſtification of parſimony, harden their hearts, and withhold their hands; and while they ſee the anguiſh of miſery, and hear the cries of want, can paſs by without pity and without regard; and without even feeling any reproaches from their hearts, pray to God for that mercy which they have themſelves denied to their fellow beings.

One of the pleas which is alleged in juſtification of the neglect of charity, is inability to practiſe it; an excuſe, when real, to which no objection can be made; for it cannot be expected that any man ſhould give to another what he muſt himſelf want in the ſame degree. But this excuſe is too frequently offered by thoſe who are poor only in their own opinion, who have habituated themſelves to look on thoſe that are above, rather than on thoſe that are below them, and cannot account themſelves rich while they ſee any richer; men who meaſure their revenues, not by the wants of nature, but by the demands of vanity; and who have nothing to give, only becauſe they will not diminiſh any particle of their ſplendour, nor reduce the pomp of their equipage; who, while their tables are heaped with delicacies, and their houſes crowded with feſtal aſſemblies, ſuffer the poor to languiſh in the ſtreets in miſeries and in want, complain that their fortunes are not equal to the generoſity of their minds, and applaud their own inclinations to charity and mercy; inclinations which are never exerted in beneficence, becauſe they cannot ſpare any thing from their appetites and their pride.

Others there are who frequently delight to dwell upon the excellency of charity, and profeſs themſelves ready to comply with its precepts whenever proper objects ſhall be propoſed, and an opportunity of proper application ſhall be found; but they pretend that they are ſo *well* informed, with regard to the perverſion of charity, and diſcover ſo many ill effects of indiſtinguiſhing and careleſs liberality, that they are

not easily satisfied with the occasions which are offered them. They are sometimes afraid of encouraging idleness, and sometimes of countenancing imposture, and so readily find objections to every method of charity that can be mentioned to them, that their good inclinations are of very little advantage to the rest of mankind; but, however, they congratulate themselves upon their merit, and still applaud that generosity by which calamity was never softened, and by which want never was relieved.

But that all these imaginary pleas may be once more confuted, that the opportunity of charity which Providence has this day put into our hands may not be neglected, and that our alms may be given in such a manner as may obtain acceptance with the great Judge of all the earth, who has promised to shew mercy to the merciful, I shall endeavour to lay before you,

First, The importance and necessity of the practice of charity.

Secondly, The disposition of mind which is necessary to make our alms acceptable to God.

Thirdly, The reasonableness of laying hold on the present opportunity for the exercise of our charity.

And, first, I shall endeavour to shew the importance and necessity of the practice of charity. The importance and necessity of charity is so evident, that as it might be hoped that no proof could be necessary, so it is difficult to produce any arguments which do not occur of themselves to every reasonable and attentive mind. For whither can we turn our thoughts, or direct our eyes, where we shall not find some motive to the exercise of charity.

If we look up to heaven, which we have been taught to consider as the particular residence of the Supreme Being, we find there our Creator, our Preserver, and our Judge; our Creator, whose infinite power gave us our existence, and who has taught us, by that gift, that bounty is agreeable to his nature; our Preserver, of whose assistance and protection we

are, every day and every moment, in need, and whose favour we can hope to secure only by imitating his goodness, and endeavouring the assistance and protection of each other; and our Judge, who has already declared that the merciful shall obtain mercy, and that in the awful day in which every man shall be recompensed according to his works, he that *soweth* sparingly shall *reap* also sparingly.

If we cast our eyes over the earth, and extend our observations through the system of human beings, what shall we find but scenes of misery, and innumerable varieties of calamity and distress, the pains of sickness, the wounds of casualty, the gripings of hunger, and the cold of nakedness; wretches wandering without an habitation, exposed to the contempt of the proud, and the insults of the cruel, goaded forward, by the stings of poverty, to dishonest acts, which perhaps relieve their present misery, only to draw some more dreadful distress upon them? And what are we taught by all these different states of unhappiness? what, but the necessity of that virtue by which they are relieved; by which the orphan may be supplied with a father, and the widow with a defender; by which nakedness may be clothed, and sickness set free from adventitious pains; the stranger solaced in his wanderings, and the hungry restored to vigour and to ease.

If we turn from these melancholy prospects, and cast our eyes upon ourselves, what shall we find, but a precarious and frail being, surrounded on every side with danger, and besieged with miseries and with wants? miseries, which we cannot avert by our own power, and wants which our own abilities cannot supply. We perceive ourselves wholly unable to stand alone, and compelled to solicit, every moment, the assistance of our fellow-creatures; whom perhaps our Maker enables us at present to repay by mutual kindness, but whom we know not how soon we may be necessitated to implore, without the capacity of returning their beneficence.

This reflection surely ought immediately to convince us

of the necessity of Charity. Prudence, even without religion, ought to admonish every one to assist the helpless, and relieve the wretched that, when the day of distress shall come upon him, he may confidently ask that assistance, which he himself, in his prosperity, never did deny.

As it has pleased God to place us in a state in which we are surrounded with innumerable temptations; so it has pleased him, on many occasions, to afford us *temporal incitements* to virtue, as a counterbalance to the allurements of sin; and to set before us rewards which may be obtained, and punishments which may be suffered, before the final determination of our future state. As charity is one of our most important duties, we are pressed to its practice by every principle of secular, as well as religious, wisdom; and no man can suffer himself to be distinguished for hardness of heart, without danger of feeling the consequence of his wickedness in his present state; because no man can secure to himself the *continuance* of riches, or of power; nor can prove, that he *shall not* himself *want* the assistance which he now *denies*, and perhaps be compelled to implore it from those whose petition he now rejects, and whose miseries he now insults. Such is the instability of human affairs, and so frequently does God assert his government of the world, by exalting the low, and depressing the powerful.

If we endeavour to consult higher wisdom than our own, with relation to this duty, and examine the opinions of the rest of mankind, it will be found, that all the nations of the earth, however they may differ with regard to every other tenet, yet agree in the celebration of benevolence, as the most amiable disposition of the heart, and the foundation of all happiness. We shall find that, in every place, men are loved and honoured in proportion to the gifts which they have conferred upon mankind, and that nothing but Charity can recommend *one* man to the affection of *another*.

But if we appeal, as is undoubtedly reasonable and just, from human wisdom to divine, and search the Holy Scrip-

tures, to settle our notions of the importance of this duty, we shall need no further incitements to its practice; for every part of that sacred volume is filled with *precepts* that direct, or *examples* that inculcate it; the practice of hospitality among the Patriarchs, the confidence of Job, amidst his afflictions, arising from the remembrance of his former charity; the precepts of the Prophets, and the conduct of the holy men of all times, concur to enforce the duty of attending to the cries of misery, and endeavouring to relieve the calamities of life.

But surely all farther proof will be superseded, when the declaration of our blessed Redeemer is remembered, who has condescended to inform us that those who have shewn mercy shall find mercy from him, that the practice of charity will be the great test by which we shall be judged, and that those, and those only, who have given food to the hungry, and raiment to the naked, shall, at the final doom, be numbered by the Son of God amongst the blessed of his Father.

There can nothing more be added to shew the necessity of the practice of charity; for what can be expected to move him, by whom everlasting felicity is disregarded; and who hears, without emotion, never-ending miseries threatened by Omnipotence? It therefore now remains that we enquire,

Secondly, How we may practise this duty in a manner pleasing to him who commanded it; or what disposition of mind is necessary to make our alms acceptable to God.

Our Saviour, as he has informed us of the necessity of charity, has not omitted to teach us likewise how our acts of charity are to be performed. And from his own precepts, and those of his apostles, may be learned all the cautions necessary to obviate the deceit of our own hearts, and to preserve us from falling into follies dangerous to our souls, while we imagine ourselves advancing in the favour of God.

We are commanded by Jesus Christ, when we give our alms, to divest ourselves of pride, vain-glory, and desire of applause; we are forbidden to give that we may be seen of

men, and instructed so to conduct our charity that it may be known to our Father which seeth in secret. By this precept it is not to be understood that we are forbidden to give alms in public, or where we may be seen of men; for our Saviour has also commanded, that our *light should so shine before men that they may see our good works, and glorify our Father which is in heaven.* The meaning therefore of this text is not that we should forbear to give alms in the *sight of men*, but that we should not suffer the presence of men to act as the motive to our charity, nor regard their praise as any object to our wishes; a precept surely reasonable; for how can that act be virtuous which depends not upon our *own* choice, but upon that of *others*, and which we should not have performed if we had not expected that they would have applauded it?

Of the same kind, though somewhat different in its immediate and literal acceptation, is the instruction contained in the text, in which we are taught, by St. Paul, that *every man* ought to give according to the purpose *of his own heart*, not grudgingly, or of necessity; by which it is commanded that we should, as our Saviour had already taught us, lay aside, in the distribution of our alms, all regard to human authority; that we should give according to the purpose of our own hearts, without respect to solicitation or influence; that we should give, because God has commanded, and give cheerfully as a proof of ready and uncompelled obedience; obedience uncompelled by any other motive than a due sense of our dependence upon the universal Lord, and the reasonableness of observing the law of Him by whom we were created.

There are likewise other rules to be observed in the practice of charity, which may be gathered, at least consequentially, from the holy scriptures; and which the common prudence of mankind at the same time evidently prescribes. It is necessary that, in bestowing our alms, we should endeavour to promote the service of God, and the general happiness of society, and, therefore, we ought not to give them, without enquiry into the ends for which they are desired; we ought

not to suffer our beneficence to be made instrumental to the encouragement of vice, or the support of idleness; because what is thus squandered may be wanted by others who would use our kindness to better purposes, and who, without our assistance, would perhaps perish.

Another precept, too often neglected, which yet a generous and elevated mind would naturally think highly necessary to be observed, is, that alms should be given in such a manner as may be most pleasing to the person who receives them; that our charity should not be accompanied with insults, nor followed by reproaches; that we should, whenever it is possible, spare the wretched the unnecessary, the mortifying pain of recounting their calamities and representing their distress; and when we have relieved them we should never upbraid them with our kindness, nor recal their afflictions to their minds by cruel and unreasonable admonitions to gratitude or industry. He only confers favours generously who appears, when they are once conferred, to remember them no more.

Poverty is in itself sufficiently afflictive, and to most minds the pain of wanting assistance is scarcely balanced by the pleasure of receiving it. The end of charity is to mitigate calamities; and he has little title to the reward of mercy who afflicts with one hand while he succours with the other. But this fault, like many others, arises from pride, and from the desire of temporal rewards. Men either forget the common nature of humanity, and therefore reproach others with those misfortunes to which they are themselves equally subject; or they expect, from the gratitude or applause of those whom they benefit, that reward which they are commanded to hope only from their Father which is in heaven.

Such are the rules of charity, and such the cautions required, to make our alms pleasing to him in whose name they ought to be given; and, that they may be *now* given not *grudgingly*, or of *necessity*, but with that cheerfulness which the apostle recommends as necessary to draw down the love of God upon those by whom they are bestowed, let us consider,

Thirdly, The reasonableness of laying hold on the present opportunity for the exercise of our charity.

It is just that we should consider every opportunity of performing a good action as the gift of God, one of the chief gifts which God bestows upon man, in his present state, and endeavour to improve the blessing, that it may not be withdrawn from us, as a talent unemployed; for it is not certain that he, who neglects this call to his duty, will be permitted to live, till he hears another. It is likewise reasonable to seize this opportunity, because perhaps none can be afforded of more useful or beneficial charity, none in which all the various purposes of charity are more compendiously united.

It cannot be said that, by this charity, idleness is encouraged; for those who are to be benefited by it are at present incapable of labour, but hereafter designed for it. Nor can it be said that vice is countenanced by it, for many of them cannot yet be vicious. Those who now give, cannot bestow their alms for the pleasure of hearing their charity acknowledged, for they who shall receive it will not know their benefactors.

The immediate effect of alms given on this occasion, is not only food to the hungry, and clothes to the naked, and an habitation to the destitute, but what is of more *lasting* advantage, *instruction* to the *ignorant*.

He that *supports* an infant, enables him to live *here*: but he that *educates* him, assists him in his passage to an happier state, and prevents that wickedness which is, if not the *necessary*, yet the *frequent consequence* of unenlightened infancy and vagrant poverty.

Nor does this charity terminate in the persons upon whom it is conferred, but extends its influence through the whole state, which has very frequently experienced, how much is to be dreaded from men, bred up without principles, and without employment. He who *begs* in the street, in his *infancy*, learns only how to *rob* there in his *manhood*: and it is certainly very apparent, with how much less difficulty evils are prevented than remedied.

But though we ſhould ſuppoſe, what reaſon and experience ſufficiently diſprove, that poverty and ignorance were calamities to thoſe only on whom they fall, yet ſurely the ſenſe of their miſery might be ſufficient to awaken us to compaſſion. For who can hear the cries of a naked infant, without remembering that he was himſelf once equally naked, equally helpleſs? Who can ſee the diſorders of the ignorant, without remembering that he was born as ignorant as they? And who can forbear to reflect, that he ought to beſtow on others thoſe benefits which he received himſelf? Who, that ſhall ſee piety and wiſdom promoted by his beneficence, can wiſh, that what he gave for ſuch uſes had been employed in any other manner? As the Apoſtle exhorts to hoſpitality, by obſerving that ſome have entertained *Angels* unawares, let us animate ourſelves to this charity, by the hopes of educating *Saints*. Let us endeavour to reclaim vice, and to improve innocence to holineſs; and remember that the day is not far diſtant, in which our Saviour has promiſed to conſider our gift to theſe little ones as given to himſelf; and that *they who have turned many to righteouſneſs ſhall ſhine forth as the ſun, for ever and ever.*

SERMON XX.

2 PETER iii. 3.

Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days Scoffers, walking after their own lusts.

A Very little acquaintance with human nature will inform us, that there are few men who can patiently bear the imputation of being in the wrong; and that there is no action, how unreasonable or wicked soever it be, which those, who are guilty of it, will not attempt to vindicate, though perhaps by such a defence as aggravates the crime.

It is indeed common for men to conceal their faults, and gratify their passions in secret, and especially, when they are first initiated in vice, to make use rather of artifice and dissimulation, than audaciousness and effrontery. But the arts of hypocrisy are, in time, exhausted, and some unhappy circumstance defeats those measures which they had laid for preventing a discovery. They are at length suspected, and by that curiosity which suspicion always excites, closely pursued, and openly detected. It is then too late to think of deceiving mankind by false appearances, nor does any thing remain, but to avow boldly what can be no longer denied. Impudence is called in to the assistance of immorality; and the censures which cannot be escaped, must be openly defied. Wickedness is in itself timorous, and naturally skulks in coverts and in darkness, but grows furious by despair, and, when it can fly no farther, turns upon the pursuer.

Such is the state of a man abandoned to the indulgence of

vicious inclinations. He justifies one crime by another; invents wicked principles to support wicked practices; endeavours rather to corrupt others, than own himself corrupted, and, to avoid that shame which a confession of his crimes would bring upon him, calls *evil good, and good evil, puts darkness for light, and light for darkness.* He endeavours to trample upon those laws which he is known not to observe, to scoff at those truths which, if admitted, have an evident tendency to convict his whole behaviour of folly and absurdity, and, from having long neglected to obey God, rises at length into rebellion against him.

That no man ever became abandoned at once, is an old and common observation, which, like other assertions founded on experience receives new confirmation by length of time. A man ventures upon wickedness, as upon waters with which he is unacquainted. He looks upon them with horror, and shudders at the thought of quitting the shore, and committing his life to the inconstancy of the weather; but, by degrees, the scene grows familiar, his aversion abates, and is succeeded by curiosity. He launches out with fear and caution, always anxious and apprehensive, lest his vessel should be dashed against a rock, sucked in by a quick-sand, or hurried by the currents beyond sight of shore. But his fears are daily lessening, and the deep becomes less formidable. In time he loses all sense of danger, ventures out with full security, and roves without inclination to return; till he is driven into the boundless ocean, tossed about by the tempests, and at last swallowed by the waves.

Most men have, or once had, an esteem and reverence for virtue, and a contempt and abhorrence of vice; of which, whether they were impressed by nature, implanted by education, or deduced and settled by reason, it is at present of very little importance to enquire. Such these notions are, however they were originally received, as reason cannot but adopt and strengthen, and every man will freely confess that reason

ought to be the rule of his conduct. Whoever therefore recedes, in his practice, from rules of which he allows the obligation, and suffers his passions to prevail over his opinions, feels at first a secret reluctance, is conscious of some sort of violence done to his intellectual powers; and though he will not deny himself that pleasure which is present before him, or that single gratification of his passions, he determines, or thinks he determines, that he will yield to no future temptation, that he will hereafter reject all the solicitation of his appetites, and live in such a manner as he should applaud in others, and as his own conscience should approve in himself.

Perhaps every man may recollect that this was the temper of his mind when he first permitted himself to deviate from the known paths of his duty, and that he never forsook them, in the early part of his life, without a design to return to them, and persevere in them; and that, when he was tempted another time, he complied, always with a tacit intention to add but this one more to his offences, and to spend the rest of his life in penitence and obedience. Perhaps there are very many among the most profligate who frequently still their consciences and animate their hopes with views of a reformation to be sincerely entered upon in some distant period of their lives, who propose to dedicate, at least, their last years to piety, and at some moments give way to wishes that they may some time taste the satisfaction of a good life, and *die the death of the righteous*.

But these, however given up to their desires and passions, however ignorant of their own weakness, and presumptuously confident of their natural powers, have not yet arrived at the summit of impiety, till they have learned, not only to neglect, but to insult religion, not only to be vicious, but to scoff at virtue.

This seems to be the last effect of a long continued habit of sin, the strongest evidence of a mind corrupted almost beyond hope of a recovery. Wickedness in this state seems to have extended its power from the passions to the understand-

ing. Not only the desire of doing well is extinguished, but the discernment of good and evil obliterated and destroyed. Such is the infatuation produced by a long course of obstinate guilt.

Not only our speculations influence our practice, but our practice reciprocally influences our speculations. We not only do what we approve, but there is danger lest in time we come to approve what we do, though for no other reason but that we do it. A man is always desirous of being at peace with himself; and when he cannot reconcile his passions to his conscience, he will attempt to reconcile his conscience to his passions; he will find reason for doing what he is resolved to do, and rather than not *walk after his own lusts*, will scoff at religion.

These scoffers may be divided into two distinct classes, to be addressed in a very different manner: those whom a constant prosecution of their lusts has deluded into a real disbelief of religion, or diverted from a serious examination of it; and those who are convinced of the truth of revelation, but affect to contemn and ridicule it from motives of interest or vanity.

I shall endeavour therefore to evince,

First, The folly of scoffing at religion in those who doubt the truth of it. And,

Secondly, The wickedness of this practice in those who believe it.

First, I shall endeavour to evince the folly of scoffing at religion in those who doubt the truth of it.

Those who in reality disbelieve, or doubt of religion, however negligent they may be in their enquiries after truth, generally profess the highest reverence for it, the sincerest desire to discover it, and the strongest resolutions to adhere to it. They will frequently assert, and with good reason, that every man is valuable in proportion to his love of truth; that man enjoys the power of reason for this great end, that he may distinguish truth from falsehood; that not to search for it is the most criminal lazinesS, and not to declare it, in opposition to

the frowns of power, or the prejudices of ignorance, the moſt deſpicable cowardice.

When they declaim on this darling ſubject, they ſeldom fail to take the opportunity of throwing out keen invectives againſt bigotry; bigotry, that voluntary blindneſs, that laviſh ſubmiſſion to the notions of others, which ſhackles the powers of the ſoul, and retards the progreſs of reaſon; that cloud, which intercepts our views, and throws a ſhade over the light of truth.

Such is the diſcourſe of theſe men; and who, that hears it, would not expect from them the moſt diſintereſted impartiality, the moſt unwearied aſſiduity, and the moſt candid and ſober attention to any thing propoſed as an argument upon a ſubject worthy of their ſtudy? Who would not imagine that they made it the grand buſineſs of their lives to carry the art of reaſoning to its greateſt height, to enlighten the underſtanding of the ignorant by plain inſtructions enforced with ſolid arguments, and to eſtabliſh every important truth upon the moſt certain and unſhaken principles?

There ſeems to be nothing more inconſiſtent with ſo philoſophical a character than careleſs vivacity and airy levity. The talents which qualify a man for a diſputant and a buffoon ſeem very different; and an unprejudiced perſon would be inclined to form contrary ideas of an argument and a jeſt.

Study has been hitherto thought neceſſary to knowledge, and ſtudy cannot well be ſucceſsfully proſecuted without ſolitude and leiſure. It might therefore be conceived that this exalted ſect is above the low employments and empty amuſements of vulgar minds; that they avoid every thing which may interrupt their meditations, or perplex their ideas; and that, therefore, whoever ſtands in need of their inſtructions muſt ſeek them in privacies and retirements, in deſerts or in cells.

But theſe men have diſcovered, it ſeems, a more compendious way to knowledge. They decide the moſt momentous queſtions amidſt the jollity of feaſts, and the exceſſes of riot.

They have found that an adversary is more easily silenced than confuted. They insult instead of vanquishing their antagonists, and decline the battle to hasten to the triumph.

It is an established maxim among them, that he who ridicules an opinion confutes it. For this reason they make no scruple of violating every rule of decency, and treating with the utmost contempt whatever is accounted venerable or sacred.

For this conduct they admire themselves, and go on applauding their own abilities, celebrating the victories they gain over their grave opponents, and loudly boasting their superiority to the advocates for religion.

As humility is a very necessary qualification for an examiner into religion, it may not be improper to depress the arrogance of these haughty champions, by shewing with how little justice they lay claim to victory, and how much less they deserve to be applauded than despised.

There are two circumstances which, either single or united, make any attainments estimable among men. The first is the usefulness of it to society. The other is the capacity or application necessary for acquiring it.

If we consider this art of scoffing with regard to either of these, we shall not find great reason to envy or admire it. It requires no depth of knowledge, or intenseness of thought. Contracted notions and superficial views are sufficient for a man who is ambitious only of being the author of a jest. That man may laugh who cannot reason; and he that cannot comprehend a demonstration may turn the terms to ridicule.

This method of controversy is, indeed, the general refuge of those whose idleness or incapacity disables them from producing any thing solid or convincing. They who are certain of being confuted and exposed in a sober dispute, imagine that by returning scurrility for reason, and by laughing most loudly when they have least to say, they shall shelter their ignorance from detection, and supply with impudence what they want in knowledge.

Nor will the poſſeſſors of this boaſted talent of ridicule appear more to deſerve reſpect on account of their uſefulneſs to mankind. Theſe gay ſallies of imagination, when confined to proper ſubjects, and reſtrained within the bounds of decency, are of no farther uſe to mankind than to divert, and can have no higher place in our eſteem than any other art that terminates in mere amuſement.

But when men treat ſerious matters ludicrouſly, when they ſtudy, not for truth, but for a jeſt, when they unite the moſt awful and moſt trifling ideas, only to tickle the imagination with the ſurpriſe of novelty, they no longer have the poor merit of diverting; they raiſe always either horror or contempt, and hazard their higheſt intereſt without even the low recompence of preſent applauſe.

That they hazard their higheſt intereſt can hardly be denied, when they determine, without the moſt ſcrupulous examination, thoſe queſtions which relate to a *future ſtate*; and none certainly are leſs likely to diſcuſs theſe queſtions with the care which they require, than thoſe who accuſtom themſelves to continual levity.

The mind, long vitiated with trifles, and entertained with wild and unnatural combinations of ideas, becomes in a ſhort time unable to ſupport the fatigue of reaſoning; it is diſguſted with a long ſucceſſion of ſolemn images, and retires from ſerious meditation and tireſome labour, to gayer fancies and leſs difficult employments.

Beſides, he that has practiſed the art of ſilencing others with a jeſt, in time learns to ſatisfy himſelf in the ſame manner. It becomes unneceſſary to the tranquillity of his own mind to confute an objection; it is ſufficient for him if he can ridicule it.

Thus he ſoon grows indifferent to truth or falſehood, and almoſt incapable of diſcerning one from the other. He conſiders eternity itſelf as a ſubject for mirth, and is equally ludicrous upon all occaſions.

What deluſions, what bigotry is equal to this! Men neg-

left to search after eternal happiness for fear of being interrupted in their mirth! If others have been misled, they have been misled by their reverence for great authorities, or by strong prejudices of education. Such errors may be extenuated, and perhaps excused. They have at least something plausible to plead, and their asserters act with some shew of reason. But what can the most extensive charity allege in favour of those men who, if they perish everlastingly, perish by their attachment to merriment and their confidence in a jest?

It is astonishing that any man can forbear enquiring seriously, whether there is a God; whether God is just; whether this life is the only state of existence; whether God has appointed rewards and punishments in a future state; whether he has given any laws for the regulation of our conduct here; whether he has given them by revelation; and whether the religion publicly taught carries any mark of divine appointment. These are questions which every reasonable being ought undoubtedly to consider with an attention suitable to their importance; and he whom the consideration of eternal happiness or misery cannot awaken from his pleasing dreams, cannot prevail upon to suspend his mirth, surely ought not to despise others for dullness and stupidity.

Let it be remembered that the nature of things is not alterable by our conduct. We cannot make truth; it is our business only to find it. No proposition can become more or less certain, or important, by being considered or neglected. It is to no purpose to wish, or to suppose that to be false which is in itself true, and therefore to acquiesce in our own wishes and suppositions, when the matter is of eternal consequence, to believe obstinately without grounds of belief, and to determine without examination, is the last degree of folly and absurdity. It is not impossible that he who acts in this manner may obtain the approbation of madmen like himself, but he will incur the contempt of every wise man; and, what is more to be feared, amidst his security and supineness, his sallies and his flights, *He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh him to scorn: the Lord shall have him in derision.*

Thus have I endeavoured to give a faint idea of the folly of those who scoff at religion, because they disbelieve, and, by scoffing, harden themselves in their disbelief. But I shall be yet more unable to describe, in a proper manner, what I am to mention in the second place,

The wickedness of those that believe religion, and yet decide it from motives of interest or vanity.

This is a degree of guilt against which it might seem, at the first view, superfluous to preach, because it might be thought impossible that it should ever be committed; as, in ancient state, no punishment was decreed for the murderer of his father, because it was imagined to be a crime not incident to human nature. But experience taught them, and teaches us, that wickedness may swell beyond imagination, and that there are no limits to the madness of impiety.

For a man to revile and insult that God whose power he allows, to ridicule that revelation of which he believes the authority divine, to dare the vengeance of *omnipotence, and* cry, *am not I in sport!* is an infatuation incredible, a degree of madness without a name. Yet there are men who, by walking after their own lusts, and indulging their passions, have reached this stupendous height of wickedness. They have dared to teach falsehoods which they do not themselves believe, and to extinguish in others that conviction which they cannot suppress in themselves.

The motive of their proceeding is sometimes a desire of promoting their own pleasures by procuring accomplices in vice. Man is so far formed for society, that even solitary wickedness quickly disgusts; and debauchery requires its combinations and confederacies, which, as intemperance diminishes their numbers, must be filled up with new proselytes.

Let those who practise this dreadful method of depraving the morals and ensnaring the soul, consider what they are engaged in! Let them consider what they are promoting, and what means they are employing! Let them pause, and reflect a little, before they do an injury that can never be repaired,

before they take away what cannot be restored; before they corrupt the heart of their companion by perverting his opinions, before they lead him into sin, and by destroying his reverence for religion, take away every motive to repentance, and all the means of reformation!

This is a degree of guilt, before which robbery, perjury and murder vanish into nothing. No mischief, of which the consequences terminate in our present state, bears any proportion to the crime of decoying our brother into the broad way of eternal misery, and stopping his ears against that holy voice that recals him to salvation.

What must be the anguish of such a man when he becomes sensible of his own crimes! How will he bear the thought of having promoted the damnation of multitudes by the propagation of known delusions! What lasting contrition, what severe repentance must be necessary for such deep and such accumulated guilt! Surely if blood be required for blood, a soul shall be required for a soul.

There are others who deride religion for the sake of displaying their own imaginations, of following the fashion of a corrupt and licentious age, or gaining the friendship of the great, or the applause of the gay. How mean must that wretch be who can be overcome by such temptations as these! Yet there are men who sell that soul which God has formed for infinite felicity, defeat the great work of their redemption, and plunge into those pains which shall never end, lest they should lose the patronage of villains, and the praise of fools.

I suppose those, whom I am now speaking of, to be in themselves sufficiently convinced of the truth of the Scriptures, and may therefore, very properly, lay before them the threatenings denounced by God against their conduct.

It may be useful to them to reflect betimes on the danger of *fearing man rather than God*; to consider that it shall avail a man nothing, if he *gain the whole world, and lose his own soul*; and that whoever *shall be ashamed of his Saviour before*

men, of him will his Saviour be ashamed before his Father which is in heaven.

That none of us may be in the number of those unhappy persons who thus scoff at the means of grace, and relinquish the hope of glory, may God, of his infinite mercy, grant, through the merits of that Saviour who hath brought life and immortality to light!

SERMON XXI.

PSALM cxlv. 9.

The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works.

IN this devout, masterly, and useful performance, the Author appears deeply sensible of the divine greatness, and peculiarly transported with contemplating GOD's infinite goodness; even to that degree, that he cheerfully engages in, and absolutely devotes himself to, the very important service of adoring and obeying this Almighty, unbounded, and most benevolent Being.

This his religion, as he intimates, was founded upon the most solid ground of reason; for, as the great Father and Lord of all is certainly matchless, and unrivalled in majesty and in power, so is he disinterested, wonderful, and glorious, in bounty and compassion; averse and slow to anger, but ready to receive, to favour and reward all who diligently seek, and faithfully serve him. *The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works.*

In discoursing on this subject, I shall consider,

First, Some arguments that support, or prove it.

Secondly, Illustrate its extensive signification and import in some remarkable instances, and conclude with a practical application.

First, I am to consider some arguments that establish this sentiment.

Our great Lord and Master has taught us, that there is none good but one, that is God. By which expression we may un-

derstand, that there is none so perfectly disinterested, so diffusively and so astonishingly good as God is. For, in another place, he instructs us both how to comprehend, and rely on, this unchangeable and never-failing attribute of the divine nature; resembling it to, or representing it by, an human quality or virtue, namely, the affection and tender regard of parents to their children. *If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father, which is in Heaven, give good things to them that ask him?* From whence it is obvious to remark, that as the humane and generous man has a peculiar tenderness for his more immediate descendants, and, proportionally to his power and influence, is willing and active to succour and relieve the indigent, to divide *ease*, lessen misery, and diffuse happiness through the world; inconceivably more affectionate is the eternal Parent unto, and regardful of, all his *intelligent creatures*, truly disposed, according to their *rank of existence*, to promote their welfare; and beyond comprehension inclined to conduct them, through the greatest variety of circumstances, to the noblest perfection, and the highest degree of felicity. In his righteous and benevolent nature there cannot possibly be the most distant tendency to caprice, severity, or selfishness; for the multitude of sharers, he knows, can never subtract from his inexhaustible fulness. He created to communicate. In every evil which he prevents, he is pleased, and in all the good that he bestows, he glories. His goodness dictated the bestowing of existence, in all its forms and with all its properties. His goodness displays itself in sustaining and disposing of all things. His goodness connects unnumbered worlds together, in one spacious, vast and unbounded universe, and embraces every system. *His tender mercies are over all his works.*

Without goodness, what apprehensions could we entertain of all the other attributes of the Divine Being? Without the utmost extent of benevolence and mercy, they would hardly be perfections or excellencies. And what would an universal

adminiſtration produce, in the hands of an evil, or a partial, or malevolent direction, but ſcenes of horror and devaſtation? Not affliction and puniſhment for the ſake of diſcipline and correction, to prevent the offence, or reform the ſinner; but heavy judgments and dreadful vengeance, to deſtroy him; or implacable wrath and fiery indignation, to prolong his miſery, and extend the duration of his torture through the revolving periods of an endleſs eternity.

Without the moſt enlarged notions of an infinite and everlaſting goodneſs in the divine nature, an impenetrable gloom muſt hang over every mind, and darkneſs overſpread the whole face of being. Neither could any other conceivable ſentiment diſperſe our ſuſpicions, or baniſh one of our guilty or ſuperſtitious fears. For ſuppoſe he confined his goodneſs to a few, without any reaſonable cauſe or juſt ground, and we could be ſo whimſically partial to ourſelves as to conceit that we were of this ſelect number; yet there could be no ſecurity of happineſs, not even to this little flock. He that choſe them by chance, might as accidentally abandon them; and as the former was without reaſon or goodneſs, the latter might be without righteouſneſs or mercy. Therefore it is infinitely deſirable to think, and we are confident of the truth of our idea, that *the Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works.*

For if he be ſelf-exiſtent, omnipotent, and poſſeſſed of perfect liberty; if it be impoſſible for him ever to err, or miſtake, in what is good and fitting, and if he enjoys an infinite ability to effect, with a thought only, what ſhall always be for the greateſt advantage, he muſt be originally and eſſentially, immutably and for ever good.

Holy ſcripture, as if beauty and goodneſs were ſynonymous terms, or inſeparable qualities, thus deſcribes him: *How great is thy goodneſs! And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us.* And, as if glory and goodneſs ſignified the ſame thing, you find, Exod. xxxiii. 18, 19, *And he ſaid, I beſeech thee, ſhew me thy glory.* To which the anſwer is, *I will*

make all my goodness pass before thee. And when, as it is written in the next chapter, the Lord descended, and proclaimed his name, or published the attributes in which he is peculiarly delighted, what is this distinguishing name, or what these divine and glorious attributes? *The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin.* The apostle sums up all these in one word, when he saith, *God is love.* Which leads me to the second thing proposed,

Namely, to illustrate the extensive signification and import of this subject by some remarkable instances. *The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works.*

No bounds can be fixed to the divine presence, nor is any part of illimitable space without his inspection and active influence. There is nothing remote, or obscure to him, nor any exceptions to his favour among all the works of his hands. Far and wide then as is the vast range of existence, so is the divine benevolence extended; and both in the previous trial, and final retribution, of all his rational and moral productions, *the Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works.*

In the first place, to illustrate this, we need only to take a transient view of the outworks of the visible creation, a general survey of the nature and correspondence of the various parts of this regular and grand machine, this finished and stupendous fabrick, in which every thing is contrived and concluded for the best.

For do but imagine an appetite, or facutly altered; or a change in the object prepared to gratify it, in any respect. Suppose a material alteration, or considerable difference in nature, and we shall easily perceive it would be a manifold disadvantage, either to individuals, or to the whole. Suppose the earth otherwise than it is, or the atmosphere and surrounding air to be varied, and in any degree more rarefied or more condensed; suppose the element of water greatly increased,

or considerably diminished; or the sun's blazing orb fixed nearer, and its vertical beams therefore stronger, or suppose it more remote, and its heat sensibly abated, the alteration would be a misfortune, if the difference did not terminate in misery and destruction. So that from the present adjustment, proportion and accommodation of all matters in the wide creation, the consequence is fairly drawn, and very evident, that *God is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works.*

This is certain of the *whole* of God's works, and is peculiarly apparent in *man*, the principal inhabitant of this earth. For, as his welfare, dignity and satisfaction, nay his happiness, and even the end of his being, depend on, and arise from, his regularity and constancy in virtue, what an infinite concern hath the Deity expressed about it? What, that can consist with liberty, hath been omitted by supreme wisdom, in this most important affair? To incline him to be moderate in all his gratifications, true pleasure proceeds from nothing else. To keep off intemperate indulgence, and to guard him against all voluptuous excesses, it is so ordained, that extravagance and inconvenience are near together, and that vice and pain are, though not immediate and inseparable associates, never far asunder; and that it is impossible for that soul to be calm and at ease, which iniquity has stained, and which impenitent guilt corrodes.

The parts of man's body are wonderfully designed, and curiously constructed; regularly disposed of, and most accurately proportioned for the safety and advantage of the whole. As apt as we may be to quarrel with our nature, suppose an instinct was struck out of our frame, or a single passion taken from us; suppose our senses any ways altered, by being either strengthened, or impaired; or even reason refined and abstracted to such a degree as to render us wholly negligent of food and raiment, necessary exercises, and secular concerns; in any of these instances, the imaginary emendation would be a real deficiency, and a proportionable deduction from the moment and quantity of our happiness.

It is evidently the ſame with reſpect to all the other creatures we are acquainted with. Their nature and condition, their qualities and circumſtances, are ſo adapted to one another that, as the intellectual powers of a being of a more exalted nature would not probably ſuit an inhabitant of this lower world, ſo neither would the capacities of human nature guide the fowls of the air, or conduct the beaſts of the field to ſo much happineſs as they find by following the motions and impulſes of ſenſe and inſtinct. *And if reflection*, enlarged ideas, and moral diſcrimination be denied them, it is plainly becauſe they would be a burthen and a misfortune, rather than a benefit to them.

But theſe univerſal notices and undeniable teſtimonies of divine goodneſs throughout the animated regions of earth, ſea and air, in the propriety and ſuitableneſs of creatures to their ſtate, and objects to their appetites, are too evident and obvious to all men to need enlargement. God's works are all wonderful; and in wiſdom and with *goodneſs hath he* made them.

Secondly, this attribute is likewiſe illuſtriouſly diſplayed in the divine providence and government of the creation, though our faculties are too limited and ſcanty, and our views too narrow and imperfect, to trace its ſecret and myſterious ways.

An omnipotent ſupport, and a perfectly wiſe direction, are evident in the laws eſtabliſhed, and regularly obſerved through all the divine productions in heaven above, or on the earth beneath. Neither have the moſt celebrated philoſophers been able, with all their boaſted ſagacity, and after all their laborious reſearches into the volume of nature, to aſſign any other cauſe, but an inviſible agency, and an immediate energy of providence, for mutual attraction in bodies, and the determination of all portions of matter to their centre; for the great ſtrength of appetite, inſtinct, and ſagacity, in animals; that the prevalence and continuance thereof ſhould be ſo preciſely and exactly commenſurate to the occaſions which re-

quire them, and that they should be no longer urgent than for the time necessary, as in the affection for their young. All which do greatly illustrate the wisdom and goodness of God's administration and superintending care.

Holy writ elegantly and emphatically describes the excellence of goodness in the divine providence in various places, particularly in this psalm, of which my text is a part. *The eyes of all wait upon thee: thou givest them their meat in due season. Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desires of every living thing. Behold* (saith our blessed Saviour) *the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns: yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow: they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.* Not one individual can be so minute and inconsiderable as to escape the notice of Heaven's all-surveying eye; nor one so importantly large, and seemingly self sufficient as to subsist a moment without the divine support. By him all things consist: *The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works.*

But Man appears the distinguished charge of the beneficent Creator; and unless providence had connected rational beings by the peculiar strong ties of mutual obligation, perpetual dependency, and inseparable interest, they would, of all creatures, be the most destitute and miserable; for there is not one that in the first stages of its existence is so totally helpless, and absolutely insufficient for its own preservation, support, or defence, as man. Therefore parental tenderness is both early and passionate, permanent and lasting. Our social dispositions and affections are enlarged to the utmost limits, and continue with us in the concluding decays, and last end of this mortal life; that we may always love one another and glorify *the Lord who is good to all, and whose tender mercies are over all his works.*

The consequences in the last place, which result from the

arguments you have heard, are so obvious, that I make no doubt but your own thoughts have already anticipated them. Ingratitude among men hath, in every age, and in every region of the earth, been an object of general detestation, and universally accounted a glaring indication of depravity of heart. If the case stand thus among mortals, whose common interests require a reciprocation of kindness and beneficence, how greatly is the crime aggravated, *when it is committed* against that being, whose goodness towards the sons of men is perfectly disinterested! The exertions of Divine Providence in our behalf tend solely to our own welfare; nor can any thing we do in return contribute, in the smallest degree, to the augmentation of the happiness of the Almighty Benefactor. This unquestionably ought to be sufficient to exact from us the most profound veneration, the most fervent gratitude, and implicit obedience to his sacred laws.

David, after having enumerated the tender *mercies of God*, is penetrated with the strongest sense of *devotion*. *My mouth* (he exclaims) *shall speak the praise of the Lord: and let all flesh bless his holy name for ever and ever.* Such was the tribute which the royal psalmist thought due to the Deity for the creation and preservation of man. The debt is accumulated to us in an infinite proportion; for while we are bounden to the same return for the same benefits voluntarily conferred upon us, a grander obligation is superadded to that for the *means of grace*, and for *the hope of glory*. Were the mercies of the Lord limited to the tenure of our present existence, great and glorious as they are, the human mind would be clouded by the consciousness that a very few years must exclude us for ever from the participation of them. But since the gracious rays of life and immortality have dissipated the gloom that hung upon futurity, since, by the propitiatory sacrifice of the Son of God, death is disarmed of his sting, and the grave deprived of its victory, divine goodness hath received its perfect consummation.

If gratitude, praise and adoration, therefore, be due to the author of our being for those blessings which we enjoy at present, it is no less our highest interest so to use them in this previous state of trial, that we may finally exchange them for those purer and incorruptible treasures reserved for the righteous in the kingdom of heaven.

Which that we may all do, may that God who created and preserves us grant, through the merits and mediation of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ!

SERMON XXIJ.

I CORINTHIANS, xi. 29.

He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself.

THE celebration of the sacrament is generally acknowledged, by the christian church, to be the highest act of devotion, and the most solemn part of positive religion, and has therefore most engaged the attention of those who either profess to teach the way to happiness or endeavour to learn it, and, like all other subjects frequently discussed by men of various interests, dispositions and capacities, has given rise to various opinions, widely different from each other.

Such is the weakness of mankind, that one error, whether admitted, or detected, is very often the cause of another. Those who reject any opinion, however justly, are commonly incited by their zeal to condemn every position in which they discover any affinity with the tenets which they oppose, of which they have been long accustomed to shew the falsehood and the danger, and therefore imagine themselves nearer to truth and safety, in proportion as they recede from them. For this reason it sometimes happens that, in passionate contests, and disputations long continued, each controversist succeeds in the confutation of his adversary's positions, and each fails in the establishment of his own.

In this manner have writers, of different persuasions, treated on the worthiness required of those who partake of the Lord's supper; a quality, not only necessary to procure the favour of God, and to give efficacy to the institution, but so

strictly enjoined in the words of the text, that to approach the holy table without it, is to pervert the means of salvation, and to turn prayer into sin.

The ardour and vehemence with which those are condemned who eat and drink unworthily, have filled the melancholy, the timorous and the humble with unnecessary terrors, which have been sometimes so much increased by the injudicious zeal of writers, erroneously pious, that they have conceived the danger of attempting to obey this precept of our Saviour more formidable than that of neglecting it, and have spent the greatest part of their lives in the omission of a duty of the highest importance; or, being equally terrified on either hand, have lived in anguish and perplexity, under a constant sense of the necessity of doing what they cannot, in their opinion, do in an acceptable manner, and which of course they shall either do, or omit, at the utmost hazard of eternal happiness.

Such exalted piety, such unshaken virtue, such an uniform ardour of divine affections, and such a constant practice of religious duties have been represented as so indispensably necessary to a worthy reception of this sacrament, as few men have been able to discover in those whom they most esteem for their purity of life, and which no man's conscience will perhaps suffer him to find in himself, and therefore those who know themselves not to have arrived at such elevated excellence, who struggle with passions which they cannot wholly conquer, and bewail infirmities which yet they perceive to adhere to them, are frighted from an act of devotion of which they have been taught to believe that it is so scarcely to be performed worthily by an embodied spirit, that it requires the holiness of angels and the uncontaminated raptures of Paradise.

Thus it appeared that, instead of being excited to ardent desires of perfection and unwearied endeavours after the utmost height of sanctity, not only the sensual and the profligate were hardened in their wickedness, by conceiving a life of piety too hard to be borne, but the diffident and scrupulous

were terrified into despair, considered vigilance and caution as unavailing fatigues, remitted their ardour, relaxed their diligence, and ceased to pursue what they could no longer hope to attain.

To remove these doubts, and disperse these apprehensions, doctrines of very different tendency have been industriously promoted; lower degrees of piety have been declared sufficient, and the dangers of reception have been extenuated; nor have any arts of interpretation been untried, or any conjecture, which sagacity or learning could produce, been forgotten, to assign to the words of the text a sense less to be dreaded by the unworthy communicant. But by these opinions, imprudently inculcated, many have been misled to consider the sacrament as little more than a cursory act of devotion; the exhortations of the apostle have lost their efficacy, and the terrors of the Lord, with which he enforces them, have no longer repressed the licentiousness of the profligate, or disturbed the indolence of the supine. Religion has sunk into ceremony; God has, without fear, been approached with the lips, when the heart has been far from him; and the supper of the Lord has been frequented by those of whom it could not be perceived that they were very solicitous to avoid the guilt of unworthy communication.

Thus have different interpretations of the same text produced errors equally dangerous, and which might have been equally obviated, by a careful attention to the nature and institution of the sacrament, an unprejudiced examination of the position of the apostle, and the comparison of this passage with other comminations; methods of enquiry which, in the explication of doubtful texts of scripture, ought always to be observed, and by which it may be proved, to the comfort of the depressed and the confirmation of the doubtful, that the sin of unworthy reception, though great, is yet to be pardoned; and to the restraint of the presumptuous, and confusion of the profane, that the preparation required is strict, though practicable, and the denunciation such as ought to terrify the negligent, though not discourage the pious.

When eternal punishments are denounced against any crime, it is always evidently the intention of the writer to declare and enforce to those that are yet innocent, the duty of avoiding them, and to those who have already committed them, the necessity of repentance, reformation and future caution. For it is not the will of God that any should perish, but that all should repent and be saved. It is not by one act of wickedness that infinite mercy will be kindled to everlasting anger, and the beneficent Father of the universe for ever alienated from his creatures; but by a long course of crimes, deliberately committed against the convictions of conscience and the admonitions of grace; by a life spent in guilt, and concluded without repentance. *No drunkard or extortioner*, says the apostle, *shall inherit eternal life.* Yet shall no man be excluded from future happiness, by a single instance, or even by long habits of intemperance, or extortion. Repentance and new life will efface his crimes, reinstate him in the favour of his judge, restore him to those promises which he has forfeited, and open the paths to eternal happiness.

Such is the crime of unworthy reception of the holy sacrament, by which *he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself:* to which no man can come unprepared, or partake of, if he is divested of the intentions suitable to so solemn a part of divine worship, without adding to the number of his sins, and, by a necessary consequence, to the danger of his soul. But though the soul is, by such an act of wickedness, endangered, it is not necessarily destroyed, or irreversibly condemned. He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, contributes, indeed, by eating and drinking, to his own damnation, as he that engages in fraudulent or unlawful commerce may be said, with great propriety, to traffic for damnation, or to set his soul to sale; yet as it is certain that fraud is not unpardonable, if it shall afterwards give way to justice, so neither is the profanation of the sacrament a crime which the goodness of God cannot forgive, if it be succeeded by true devotion. The whole life of man is a state of

probation; he is *always* in danger, and may be *always* in hope. As no ſhort fervours of piety, nor particular acts of beneficence, however exalted, can ſecure him from the poſſibility of ſinking into wickedneſs, ſo no neglect of devotion, nor the commiſſion of any crimes, can preclude the means of grace, or the hope of glory. He that has eaten and drank unworthily may enter into ſalvation, by repentance and amendment; as he that has eaten and drank *worthily may, by* negligence or preſumption, periſh everlaſtingly.

This account of the guilt of unworthy reception makes it neceſſary to enquire, whether by the original word in the text be meant, as it is tranſlated, *damnation*, the eternal puniſhments of a future ſtate; or, as it is more frequently interpreted, condemnation, temporary judgments, or worldly afflictions. For, from either ſenſe, the enormity of the crime, and the anger of God enkindled by it, is ſufficiently apparent. Every act of wickedneſs that is puniſhed with *immediate* vengeance will, if it be aggravated by *repetitions*, or not expiated by repentance, incur *final* condemnation; for temporal puniſhments are the merciful admonitions of God, to avoid, by a timely change of conduct, that ſtate in which there is no repentance, and thoſe pains which can have no end. So that the confident and preſumptuous, though it ſhould be allowed that only temporal puniſhments are threatened in the text, are to remember that, without reformation, they will be only aggravations of the crime, and that, at the laſt day, thoſe who could not be awakened to a juſt reverence of this divine inſtitution, will be deprived of the benefits of that death, of which it was eſtabliſhed as a perpetual commemoration. And thoſe who are depreſſed by unneceſſary terrors, may repel any temptations to deſpondency, by conſidering, that the crime of unworthy communication is like all others, only unpardoned where it is unrepented.

Having thus ſhewn the danger incurred by an unworthy reception of the ſacrament, it is neceſſary to enquire how it may be avoided, and to conſider,

First, What it is to eat and drink unworthily.

Secondly, By what means a man may become a worthy partaker of the Lord's supper.

First, I am to consider what it is to eat and drink unworthily.

The unworthiness with which the Corinthians are upbraided by the apostle was, in part, such as the present regulated establishment of christianity, and the assistance which religion receives from the civil power, make it unnecessary to censure, since it is not now committed even by the most presumptuous, negligent, or profane. It was a practice amongst them to assemble at the holy table in a tumultuous manner, and to celebrate the Eucharist with indecency and riot. But though such open profanation of this sacred ordinance is not now to be apprehended, and, therefore, no man needs to be cautioned against it, yet the cause which produced it is such as we cannot too anxiously fear, or too diligently avoid; for its influences are various and extensive, and often weaken the efficacy of the sacrament, though they produce no apparent disorders in the celebration of it.

The Corinthians fell into this enormous sin, says the apostle, *not discerning the Lord's body*, for want of discerning the importance and sanctity of the institution, and of distinguishing the Lord's body from the common elements of bread and wine exhibited on common occasions of festive jollity. It is therefore the first duty of every christian to discern the Lord's body, or to impress upon his mind a just idea of this act of commemoration, of the commands by which it is enforced, of the great sacrifice which it represents, and of the benefits which it produces. Without these reflections, often repeated, and made habitual by long and fervent meditation, every one will be in danger of *eating and drinking unworthily*, of receiving the sacrament without sufficient veneration, without that ardent gratitude for the death of Christ, and that steady confidence in his merits, by which the sacrament is made effica-

cious to his salvation; for of what use can it be to commemorate the death of the Redeemer of mankind without faith and without thankfulness? Such a celebration of the Sacrament is nothing less than a mockery of God, an act by which we *approach him with our lips when our hearts are far from him*; and as such insincerity and negligence cannot but be, in a very high degree, criminal, as he that eateth and drinketh thus unworthily cannot but promote his own damnation, it is necessary to enquire,

Secondly, By what means a man may become a worthy partaker of the Lord's supper.

The method by which we are directed by the apostle to prepare ourselves for the sacrament, is that of self-examination, which implies a careful regulation of our lives by the rules of the gospel; for to what purpose is our conduct to be examined, but that it may be amended, where it appears erroneous and defective? The duty of examination, therefore, is only mentioned, and repentance and reformation are supposed, with great reason, inseparable from it; for nothing is more evident than that we are to enquire into the state of our souls, as into affairs of less importance, with a view to avoid danger, or to secure happiness. When we enquire with regard to our faith, whether it be sufficiently vigorous or powerful, whether it regularly influences our conduct, restrains our passions, and moderates our desires, what is intended by this duty, but that if we find ourselves christians only in name, if we discover that the example of our divine Master has little force upon our constant conversation, and that God is seldom in our thoughts, except in the solemn acts of stated worship, we must then endeavour to invigorate our faith by returning frequently to meditate upon the objects of it, our creation, our redemption, the means of grace and the hope of glory; and to enlighten our understandings, and awaken our affections, by the perusal of writings of piety, and, above all, of the Holy Scriptures.

If any man, in his examination of his life, discovers that

he has been guilty of fraud, extortion, or injury to his neighbour, he is to make reparation to his utmost power. If he finds malice or hatred lurking in his mind, he must expel them by a strong resolution never to comply with their motions, or suffer them to break out in any real act of revenge. If he observes that he is often betrayed, by passions, or appetites, into unlawful methods of gratifying them, he must resolve to restrain them for the future, by watching and fasting, by a steady temperance and perpetual vigilance.

But let him beware of vain confidence in his own firmness, and implore, by fervent and sincere prayer, the co-operation of God's grace with his endeavours; for by grace alone can we hope to resist the numberless temptations that perpetually surround us; by grace only can we reject the solicitations of pleasure, repress the motions of anger, and turn away from the allurements of ambition. And this grace, when sincerely implored, is always granted in a degree sufficient for our salvation; and it ought, therefore, to be one of the first parts of our preparation for the Sacrament, to pray for that grace, without which our examination itself will be useless, because, without it, no pious resolution can be formed, nor any virtue be practised.

As, therefore, it is only by an habitual and unrepented unworthiness that damnation is incurred, let no man be harassed with despondency for any past irreverence or coldness! As the Sacrament was instituted for one of the means of grace, let no one, who sincerely desires the salvation of his own soul, neglect to receive it; and as eternal punishment is denounced by the Apostle against all those who receive it unworthily, let no man approach the Table of the Lord, without repentance of his former sins, steadfast purposes of a new life, and full confidence in his merits, whose death is represented by it.

SERMON XXIII.

(Preached on the 30th of January.)

JAMES, iii. 16.

Where envying and strife is, there is confusion.

THAT the life of man is unhappy, that his days are not only few, but evil, that he is surrounded by dangers, distracted by uncertainties, and oppressed by calamities, requires no proof. This is a truth which every man confesses, or which he that denies it denies against conviction. Accordingly we find the miseries of our present state lamented by writers of every class, from the inspired teachers of religion, who admonish us of our frailty and infelicity, that they may incite us to labour after a better state, where *there is fulness of joy, and pleasures for evermore*, to the vainest and loosest author, whose design is to teach methods, not of improving, but of wasting time, and whose doctrine St. Paul, speaking in a borrowed character, has well expressed in one short sentence, *Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.*

When such is the condition of beings, not brute and savage, but endowed with reason and united in society, who would not expect that they should join in a perpetual confederacy against the certain, or fortuitous troubles to which they are exposed? that they should universally co-operate in the promotion of universal felicity? that every man should easily discover that his own happiness is connected with that of every other man? that thousands and millions should continue together, as partakers of one common nature? and that every

eye should be vigilant, and every hand active, for the confirmation of ease, and the prevention of misfortune?

This expectation might be formed by speculative wisdom, but experience will soon dissipate the pleasing illusion. A slight survey of life will shew that, instead of hoping to be happy in the general felicity, every man pursues a private and independent interest, proposes to himself some peculiar convenience, and prizes it more, as it is less attainable by others.

When the ties of society are thus broken, and the general good of mankind is subdivided into the separate advantages of individuals, it must necessarily happen that many will desire what few can possess, and consequently that some will be fortunate by the disappointment, or defeat of others, and since no man suffers disappointment without pain, that one must become miserable by another's happiness.

This is, however, the natural condition of human life. As it is not possible for a being, necessitous and insufficient as man, to act wholly without regard to his interest, so it is difficult for him to place his interest at such a distance from him, as to act, with constant and uniform diligence, in hopes only of happiness flowing back upon him in its circulation through a whole community, to seek his own good, only by seeking the good of all others, of many whom he cannot know, and of many whom he cannot love. Such a diffusion of interest, such sublimation of self-love is to all difficult, because it so places the end at a great distance from the endeavour; it is to many impossible, because to many the end, thus removed, will be out of sight. And so great are the numbers of those whose views either nature has bounded, or corruption has contracted, that whoever labours only for the public, will soon be left to labour alone, and driven from his attention to the universe, which his single care will very little benefit, to the inspection of his own business, and the prosecution of his private wishes. Every man has, in the present state of things, wants which cannot wait for public plenty, and vexations which must be quieted before the days of universal peace. And no man can

live only for others, unless he could persuade others to live only for him.

The misery of the world, therefore, so far as it arises from the inequality of conditions, is incurable. There are desires, which almost all feel, but which all cannot gratify. Every man may, without a crime, study his own happiness, if he be careful not to impede, by design, the happiness of others. In the race of life, some must gain the prize, and others must lose it; but the prize is honestly gained by him who outruns his competitor, without endeavouring to overthrow him.

In the prosecution of private interest, which Providence has either ordained or permitted, there must necessarily be some kind of strife. Where blessings are thrown before us, as the reward of industry, there must be a constant struggle of emulation. But this strife would be without confusion, if it were regulated by reason and religion, if men would endeavour after lawful ends by lawful means.

But as there is a laudable desire of meliorating the condition of life, which communities may not only allow, but encourage, as the parent of useful arts, by which first necessity was supplied, and conveniencies will always be multiplied; as there is likewise an honest contention for preference and superiority, by which the powers of greater minds are pushed into action, and the ancient boundaries of science are overpast; so there is likewise a strife, of a pernicious and destructive kind, which daily disturbs the quiet of individuals, and too frequently obstructs or disturbs the happiness of nations; a strife which always terminates in confusion, and which it is therefore every man's duty to avoid himself, and every man's interest to repress in others.

This *strife*, of which cometh *confusion*, the apostle has, in his prohibition, joined with envying. And daily experience will prove that he has joined them with great propriety; for perhaps there has seldom been any great and lasting strife in the world, of which envy was not either the original motive, or the most forcible incentive. The ravages of religious en-

thusiasts, and the wars kindled by difference of opinions, may perhaps be considered as calamities which cannot properly be imputed to envy; yet even these may often be justly suspected of rising from no higher or nobler causes. A man convinced of the truth of his own tenets, wishing the happiness of others, and considering happiness as the certain consequence of truth, is necessarily prompted to extend his opinions, and to fill the world with proselytes. But surely pure zeal cannot carry him beyond warm dispute and earnest exhortation; because by dispute and exhortation alone can *real* proselytes be made. Violence may extort confession from the tongue, but the mind must remain unchanged. Opinion, whether false or true, whether founded on evidence, or raised by prejudice, stands equally unshaken in the tempests of commotion, and sets at defiance the flames of hostility, and the sword of persecution.

No man, whose reason is not darkened by some inordinate perturbation of mind, can possibly judge so absurdly of beings partakers of the same nature with himself, as to imagine that any opinion can be recommended by cruelty and mischief, or that he who cannot perceive the force of argument, will be more efficaciously instructed by penalties and tortures. The power of punishment is to *silence*, not to *confute*. It therefore can never serve for the effectual propagation, or obstruction of doctrines. It may indeed sometimes hinder the dissemination of falsehood, and check the progress of error, but can never promote the reception of truth.

Whenever, therefore, we find the teacher jealous of the honour of his sect, and apparently more solicitous to see his opinions *established* than *approved*, we may conclude that he has added envy to his zeal; and that he feels more *pain from the want of victory*, than *pleasure from the enjoyment of truth*.

It is the present mode of speculation to charge these men with total hypocrisy, as wretches who have no other design but that of temporal advancement, and consider religion only as one of the means by which power is gained, or wealth ac-

cumulated. But this charge, whatever may have been the depravity of single persons, is by no means generally true. The persecutor and enthusiast have often been superior to the desire of worldly possessions, or, at least, have been abstracted from it by stronger passions. There is a kind of mercantile speculation, which ascribes every action to interest, and considers interest as only another name for pecuniary advantage. But the boundless variety of human affections is not to be thus easily circumscribed. Causes and effects, motives and actions, are complicated and diversified without end. *Many* men make party subservient to personal purposes; and many likewise suffer all private considerations to be absorbed and lost in their zeal for some public cause. But envy still operates, however various in its appearance, however disguised by specious pretences, or however removed from notice by intermediate causes. All violence, beyond the necessity of self-defence, is incited by the desire of humbling the opponents, and, whenever it is applied to the decision of religious questions, aims at conquest rather than conversion.

Since, therefore, envy is found to operate so often and so secretly, and the *strife* which arises from it is certain to end in *confusion*, it is surely the duty of every man who desires the prosperity of his country, as connected with a particular community, or the general happiness of the world, as allied to general humanity,

First, To consider, by what tokens he may discover in himself, or others, that *strife* which springs from *envy*, and ends in *confusion*.

Secondly, What are the evils produced by that *confusion* which proceeds from *strife*.

First, Let us consider, by what tokens we may discover in ourselves, or others, that *strife* which springs from *envy*, and ends in *confusion*.

That strife may well be supposed to proceed from some corrupt passion, which is carried on with vehemence, disproportioned to the importance of the end openly proposed. Men

naturally value eafe and tranquillity at a very high rate, and will not, on very fmall caufes, either fuffer labour, or excite oppofition. When, therefore, any man voluntarily engages in tafks of difficulty, and incurs danger, or fuffers hardfhips, it muft be imagined that he propofes to himfelf fome reward, more than equivalent to the comforts which he thus refigns, and of which he feems to triumph in the refignation; and if it cannot be found, that his labours tend to the advancement of fome end, worthy of fo much affiduity, he may juftly be fuppofed to have formed to himfelf fome imaginary intereft, and to feek his gratification, not in that which he himfelf gains, but which another lofes.

It is a token that ftrife proceeds from unlawful motives, when it is profecuted by unlawful means. He that feeks only the right, and only for the fake of right, will not eafily fuffer himfelf to be tranfported beyond the juft and allowed methods of attaining it. To do evil that good may come, can never be the purpofe of a man who has not perverted his morality by fome falfe principle; and falfe principles are not fo often collected by the judgment, as fnatched up by the paffions. The man whofe duty gives way to his convenience, who, when once he has fixed his eye upon a diftant end, haftens to it by violence over forbidden ground, or creeps on towards it through the crooked paths of fraud and ftratagem, as he has evidently fome other guide than the word of God, muft be fuppofed to have likewife fome other purpofe than the glory of God, or the benefit of man.

The evidence of corrupt defigns is much ftrengthened, when unlawful means are ufed, in preference to thofe which are recommended by reafon, and warranted by juftice.

When that which would have been granted to requeft, or yielded to remonftrance, is wantonly feized by fudden violence, it is apparent that violence is chofen for its own fake, and that the claimant pleafes himfelf, not with the *poffeffion*, but the *power* by which it was gained, and the mortification

of him, to whom his superiority has not allowed the happiness of choice, but has at once taken from him the honour of keeping, and the credit of resigning.

There is another token that strife is produced by the predominance of some vicious passion, when it is carried on against natural or legal, superiority. This token, though perhaps it is not very frequently fallacious, is not equally certain with the former; because that *superiority, which* nature gives, or institutions establish, too frequently incites insolence, or oppression; such insolence as may justly be restrained, and such oppression as may be lawfully resisted. Many modes of tyranny have been practised in the world, of which it is more natural to ask, with wonder, why they were submitted to so long, than why they were at last opposed and quelled. But if history and experience inform us that power and greatness grow wanton and licentious, that wealth and prosperity elate the mind, and enslave the understanding to *desire*, and when men once find that no one has power *to controul them*, they are seldom very attentive to justice, or very careful to controul themselves: History and experience will likewise shew us, that the contrary condition has its temptations and its crimes, that he who considers himself as subject to another, and liable to suffer by caprice or wickedness, often anticipates the evils of his state, imagines himself to feel what he only fears, and imputes every failure of negligence, or start of passion, to studied tyranny and settled malevolence. To be inferior is necessarily unpleasing, to be placed in a state of inferiority to those who have no eminent abilities, or transcendent merit, (which must happen in all political constitutions) increases the uneasiness; and every man finds in himself a strong inclination to throw down from their elevated state those whom he obeys without approbation, whom he reverences without esteem. When the passions are once in motion, they are not easily appeased, or checked. He that has once concluded it lawful to resist power, when it wants merit, will soon find a want of merit, to justify his own resistance of power.

Thus, if we consider the conduct of individuals towards each other, we shall commonly find the labourer murmuring at him who seems to live by easier means. We shall hear the poor repining that others are rich, and even the rich speaking with malignity of those who are still richer than themselves.

And if we survey the condition of kingdoms and commonwealths, it will always be observed, that governors are censured, that every mischief of chance is imputed to ill designs, and that nothing can persuade mankind, that they are not injured by an administration, either unskilful, or corrupt. It is very difficult always to do right. To seem always to do right to those who desire to discover wrong, is scarcely possible. Every man is ready to form expectations in his own favour, such as never can be gratified, and which will yet raise complaints, if they are disappointed.

Such is commonly the disposition, with which men look upon those who are placed above them, and with such dispositions we cannot hope that they should be often pleased. Life is a state of imperfection, and yet every man exacts from his superiors consummate wisdom, and unfailing virtue; and whenever he sees, or believes himself to see, either vice or error, thinks himself at liberty to loosen the ties of duty, and pass the boundaries of subordination, without considering that of such *strife* there must come *confusion*, or without knowing, what we shall consider,

Secondly, The evils and mischiefs produced by that *confusion* which arises from *strife*.

That the destruction of order, and the abolition of stated regulations, must fill the world with uncertainty, distraction and solicitude, is apparent, without any long deduction of argument. Yet it has too frequently happened, that those who either feel their wishes restrained, see their fortunes wearing away, or imagine their merit neglected, and their abilities employed upon business unworthy of their attention, desire times of tumult and disturbance, as affording the fairest opportunities for the active and sagacious to distinguish themselves, and as throwing open the avenues of wealth and honour, to be em-

tered by those who have the greatest quickness of discernment, and celerity of dispatch. In times of peace every thing proceeds in a train of regularity, and there is no sudden advantage to be snatched, nor any unusual change of condition to be hoped. But when sedition and uproar have once silenced law, and confounded property, then is the hour when chance begins to predominate in the world, when every man may hope without bounds, and those, who *know how to improve* the lucky moment, may gain in a *day what no length* of labour could have procured, without the concurrence of casual advantage.

This is the expectation which makes some hasten on confusion, and others look with concern at its approach. But what is this other than gaining by universal misery, supplying by force the want of right, and rising to sudden elevation, by the sudden downfal of others?

The great benefit of society is that the weak are protected against the strong. The great evil of *confusion is that the* world is thrown into the hands, not *of the best*, but of the strongest; that all certainty of possession or acquisition is destroyed; that every man's care is confined to his own interest; and that general negligence of the general good makes way for general licentiousness.

Of the strife, which this day brings back to our remembrance, we may observe, that it had all the tokens of *strife* proceeding from *envy*. The rage of the faction, which invaded the rights of the Church and Monarchy, was disproportionate to the provocation received. The violence, with which hostility was prosecuted, was more than the cause, that was publicly avowed, could incite or justify. Personal resentment was apparent in the persecution of particular men, and the bitterness of faction broke out in all the debates upon public questions. No securities could quiet suspicion, no concessions could satisfy exorbitance. Usurpation was added to usurpation; demand was accumulated on demand; and, when war had decided against loyalty, insult was added to insult, and exaction to exaction.

As the end was unjust, the means likewise were illegal. The power of the faction, commenced by clamour, was promoted by rebellion, and established by murder; by murder of the most atrocious kind, deliberate, contumelious, and cruel; by murder, not necessary even to the safety of those by whom it was committed, but chosen in preference to any other expedient for security.

This war certainly did not want the third token of *strife* proceeding from *envy*. It was a war of the rabble against their superiors; a war, in which the lowest and basest of the people were encouraged by men a little higher than themselves, to lift their hands against their ecclesiastical and civil Governors, and by which those, who were grown impatient of obedience, endeavoured to obtain the power of commanding.

This *strife*, as we all know, ended in *confusion*. Our laws were overruled, our rights were abolished. The soldier seized upon the property; the fanatick rushed into the church; the Usurpers gave way to other Usurpers; the Schismaticks were thrust out by other Schismaticks; the people felt nothing from their masters but alternatives of oppression, and heard nothing from their teachers but varieties of error.

Such was the *strife*, and such was the *confusion*. Such are the evils which God sometimes permits to fall upon nations, when they stand secure in their own greatness, and forget their dependence on universal sovereignty, depart from the laws of their Maker, corrupt the purity of his worship, or swerve from the truth of his revelation. Such evils surely we have too much reason to fear again, for we have no right to charge our Ancestors with having provoked them by crimes greater than our own.

Let us therefore be warned by the calamities of past ages; and those miseries, which are due to our sins, let us avert by our penitence. *Let the wicked forsake his ways, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, and he will abundantly pardon.*

SERMON XXIV.

PROVERBS, XXIX. 2.

When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice.

THAT the inſtitutions of government owe their original, like other human actions, to the deſire of happineſs, is not to be denied; nor is it leſs generally allowed, that they have been perverted to very different ends from thoſe which they were intended to promote. This is a truth which it would be very ſuperfluous to prove by authorities, or illuſtrate by examples. Every page of hiſtory, whether ſacred or profane, will furniſh us abundantly with inſtances of rulers that have deviated from juſtice, and ſubjects that have forgotten their allegiance; of nations ruined by the tyranny of governors, and of governors overborne by the madneſs of the populace. Inſtead of a concurrence between governor and ſubjects for their mutual advantage, they ſeem to have conſidered each other, not as allies or friends, to be aided or ſupported, but as enemies, whoſe proſperity was inconſiſtent with their own, and who were therefore to be ſubdued by open force, or ſubjected by ſecret ſtratagems. Thus have ſlavery and licentiouſneſs ſucceeded one another, and anarchy and deſpotic power alternately prevailed. Virtue has, at one time, ſtood expoſed to the puniſhments of vice; and vice, at another time, enjoyed the ſecurity and privileges of virtue. Nor have communities ſuffered more, when they were expoſed to the paſſions and caprices of one man, however cruel, ambitious, or inſolent, than when all reſtraint has been taken off the actions of men by public confuſions, and every one left at full liberty to indulge his own deſires, and comply, without fear of puniſhment, with his wildeſt imaginations.

Man is, for the moſt part, equally unhappy, when ſubjected, without redreſs, to the paſſions of another, or left, without controul, to the dominion of his own. This every man, how-

ever unwilling he may be to own it of himself, will very readily acknowledge of his neighbour. No man knows any one, except himself, whom he judges fit to be set free from the coercion of laws, and to be abandoned entirely to his own choice. By this consideration have all civilized nations been induced to the enactions of penal laws, laws by which every man's danger becomes every man's safety, and by which, though all are restrained, yet all are benefited.

Government is therefore necessary, in the opinion of every one, to the safety of particular men, and the happiness of society; and it may be considered as a maxim universally admitted, that *the people* cannot *rejoice*, except *the righteous are in authority*: that no public prosperity, or private quiet, can be hoped for, but from the justice and wisdom of those to whom the administration of affairs and the execution of the laws is committed. For corrupt governments operate, with equal force and efficacy, to the destruction of a people, as good governments to their preservation.

But that authority may never swell into tyranny, or languish into supineness, and that subjection may never degenerate into slavery, nor freedom kindle into rebellion, it may be proper, both for those who are entrusted with power, and those from whom obedience is required, to consider,

First, How much it is the duty of those in authority to promote the happiness of the people.

Secondly, By what means the happiness of the people may be most effectually promoted.

Thirdly, How the people are to assist and further the endeavours of their governors.

First, How much it is the duty of those in authority to promote the happiness of the people.

If it be true in general that no man is born merely for his own sake, to consult his own advantage or pleasure, unconnected with the good of others; it is yet more evidently true of those who are exalted into high rank, dignified with honours, and invested with authority. Their superiority is not to

be considered as a sanction for laziness, or a privilege for vice. They are not to conceive that their passions are to be allowed a wider range, or their appetites set more free from subjection to reason, than those of others. They are not to consult their own glory, at the expense of the lives of others, or to gratify their avarice, by plundering those whom diligence and labour have entitled to affluence. They are not to conceive that power gives a right to oppress, and to punish those who murmur at oppression. They are to look upon their power and their greatness as instruments placed in their hands, to be employed for the public advantage. They are to remember they are placed upon an eminence, that their examples may be more conspicuous, and that, therefore, they must take care lest they teach those vices which they ought to suppress. They must reflect, that it is their duty to secure property from the attempts of rapine and robbery, and that those whom they protect will be very little benefited by their care, if what they rescue from others they take away themselves.

It appears from those struggles for dominion, which have filled the world with war, bloodshed and desolation, and have torn in pieces almost all the states and kingdoms of the earth, and from those daily contests for subordinate authority which disturb the quiet of smaller societies, that there is somewhat in power more pleasing than in any other enjoyment; and, consequently, to bestow upon man the happiness of ruling others, is to bestow upon him the greatest benefit he is capable of receiving. Nothing then can equal the obligation of governors to the people, and nothing but the most flagrant ingratitude can make them careless of the interests, or unconcerned at the misfortunes of those to whom they owe that, for which no danger has been thought too dreadful to be encountered, no labour too tedious to be undergone, and no crime too horrible to be committed. Gratitude is a species of justice. He that requites a benefit may be said, in some sense, to pay a debt; and, of course, he that forgets favours received may be accused of neglecting to pay what he cannot be denied to owe.

But this is not the only sense in which justice may be said to require from a Governor an attention to the wants and petitions of the people. He that engages in the management of public business, takes a trust upon him, which it was in his power to decline, and which he is therefore bound to discharge with diligence and fidelity; a trust which is of the highest honour, because it is of the greatest difficulty and importance, a trust which includes, not only the care of the property, but of the morals of the people.

It is with the justest reason, that large revenues, pompous titles, and all that contributes to the happiness of life, are annexed to these high offices; for what reward can be too great for him, to whom multitudes are indebted for the secure enjoyment of their possessions? for him, whose authority checks the progress of vice, and assists the advancement of virtue, restrains the violence of the oppressor, and asserts the cause of the injured? These are doubtless merits above the common rate, merits which can hardly be too loudly celebrated, or too liberally rewarded.

But it is always to be observed, that he only deserves the recompense, who performs the work for which it is proposed; and that he, who wears the honours, and receives the revenues, of an exalted station, without attending to the duties of his post, is, in a very high degree, criminal, both in the eye of God and man.

It is, therefore, the certain and apparent duty of those that are in authority, to take care that the people may rejoice, and diligently to enquire, what is to be considered,

Secondly, By what means the happiness of the people may be most effectually promoted.

In political, as well as natural disorders, the great error of those who commonly undertake, either cure or preservation, is, that they rest in second causes, without extending their search to the remote and original sources of evil. They therefore obviate the immediate evil, but leave the destructive principle to operate again; and have their work for ever to

begin, like the husbandman who mows down the heads of noisome weeds, instead of pulling up the roots.

The only uniform and perpetual cause of public happiness is public virtue. The effects of all other things which are considered as advantages, will be found casual and transitory. Without virtue nothing can be securely possessed, or properly enjoyed.

In a country like ours, the great demand, which is for ever repeated to our Governors, is for the *security of property*, the confirmation of liberty, and the extension of commerce. All this we have obtained, and all this we possess, in a degree which perhaps was never granted to any other people. Yet we still find something wanting to our happiness, and turn ourselves round on all sides, with perpetual restlessness, to find that remedy for our evils which neither power nor policy can afford.

That established property and inviolable freedom are the greatest of political felicities, no man can be *supposed likely* to deny. To depend on the will of another, to labour for that, of which arbitrary power can prohibit the enjoyment, is the state to which want of reason has subjected the brute. To be happy we must know our own rights; and we must know them to be safe.

But though this knowledge be necessary to happiness, this knowledge is not sufficient. Liberty, if not regulated by virtue, can be only licence to do evil; and property, if not virtuously enjoyed, can only corrupt the possessor, and give him the power to injure others. Trade may make us rich; but riches, without goodness, cannot make us happy.

Let us, however, suppose that these external goods have that power which wisdom cannot believe, and which experience never could confirm; let us suppose that riches and liberty could make us happy. It then remains to be considered, how riches and liberty can be secured. To this the Politician has a ready answer, that they are to be secured by laws wisely formed, and vigorously executed. But, as laws can

be made only by a ſmall part of an extenſive empire, and muſt be executed by a part yet far ſmaller, what ſhall protect us againſt the laws themſelves? And how ſhall we be certain, that they ſhall not be made without regard to the public good, or ſhall not be perverted to oppreſſion by the miniſters of juſtice?

But if proſperity, and laws, by which, as far as the mutability of this world permits, that proſperity is made permanent and ſafe, cannot make the people happy, what is it the Governors can do? How far is their care to be extended, and what more can ſkill and vigilance perform? The wiſdom of mankind has been exerciſed in enquiries how riches may be gained and kept; how the different claims of men may be adjuſted without violence; and how one part of the community may be reſtrained from encroachments on the other. For this end governments have been inſtituted, in all their various forms, with much ſtudy, and too often with much bloodſhed. But what is the uſe of all this, if, when theſe ends are obtained, there is yet ſo much wanting to felicity?

I am far from intending to inſinuate, that the ſtudies of political wiſdom, or the labours of legiſlative patriotiſm, have been vain and idle. They are uſeful, but not effectual; they are conducive to that end, which yet they cannot fully gain. The Legiſlator, who does what human power can attain towards the felicity of his fellow-creatures, is not to be cenſured, becauſe, by the imbecility of all human endeavours, he fails of his purpoſe; unleſs he has become culpable, by aſcribing too much to his own powers, and arrogated to his induſtry, or his wit, that efficacy which wit and induſtry muſt always want, unleſs ſome higher power lends them aſſiſtance, and co-operates with them.

The husbandman may plow his fields with induſtry, and ſow them with ſkill; he may manure them copiouſly, and ſauce them carefully; but the harveſt muſt depend at laſt on the celeſtial influence; and all his diligence is fruſtrated, unleſs the ſun ſheds its warmth, and the clouds pour down their

moisture. Thus, in all human affairs, when prudence and industry have done their utmost, the work is left to be completed by superior agency; and in the security of peace, and stability of possession, our policy must at last call for help upon religion.

Human laws, however honestly instituted, or however vigorously enforced, must be limited in their effect, partly by our ignorance, and partly by our weakness. Daily experience may convince us, that all the avenues by which injury and oppression may break in upon life, cannot be guarded by positive prohibitions. Every man sees, and may feel, evils, which no law can punish. And not only will there always remain possibilities of guilt, which legislative foresight cannot discover, but the laws will be often violated by wicked men, whose subtilty eludes detection, and whom therefore, vindictive justice cannot bring within the reach of punishment.

These deficiencies in civil life can be *supplied only by religion*. The mere observer of human laws avoids only such offences as the laws forbid, and those only when the laws can detect his delinquency. But he who acts with the perpetual consciousness of the divine presence, and considers himself as accountable for all his actions to the irreversible and unerring judgment of omniscience, has other motives of action, and other reasons of forbearance. He is equally restrained from evil, in public life, and in secret solitude; and has only one rule of action, by which *he does to others what he would that others should do to him*, and wants no other enforcement of his duty, than the fear of future punishment, and the hope of future rewards.

The first duty therefore of a Governor is to diffuse through the community a spirit of religion, to endeavor that a sense of the divine authority should prevail in all orders of men, and that the laws should be obeyed, in subordination to the universal and unchangeable edicts of the Creator and Ruler of the world.

How religion may be most effectually promoted, is an en-

quiry which every Governor ought diligently to make; and he that enquires, with real wishes for reformation, will soon know his duty; for Providence has seldom made the same things necessary and abstruse.

That religion may be invigorated and diffused, it is necessary that the external order of religion be diligently maintained, that the solemnities of worship be duly observed, and a proper reverence preserved for the times and the places appropriated to piety. The appropriations of time and place are indeed only means to the great end of holiness; but they are means, without which the end cannot be obtained; and every man must have observed, how much corruption prevails, where the attention to public worship and to holy seasons is broken or relaxed.

Those that have in their hands the disposal of riches or honours ought to bestow them on persons who are most eminent for sanctity of life. For though no man ought to consider temporary goods as the proper rewards of religious duties, yet they, who have them to give, are obliged to distribute them in such a manner as may make them most useful to the public; and they will be most useful, when they increase the power of beneficence, and enlarge the influence of piety.

It yet remains that Governors co-operate with their laws by their own examples, and that as, by their height of place, they are always conspicuous, they exhibit to those eyes which are turned upon them *the beauty of holiness*.

The present state of the world however affords us little hope, that virtue can, by any government, be so strongly impressed, or so widely diffused, as to supercede the necessity of suppressing wickedness. In the most diligent cultivation of the happiest soil, weeds will sometimes appear among fruits and flowers, and all that vigilance and labor can do is to check them as they rise. However virtue way be encouraged or rewarded, it can never appear to all minds the shortest means of present good. There will always be those who would rather grow rich by fraud, than by diligence, and who will pro-

vide for vicious pleasures by violence rather than by labour. Against the attempts and artifices of such men, whence have simplicity and innocence their defence and security? Whence, but from the *Lex armata*, the vindictive law, that stands forth the champion of the weak, and the protectress of the innocent?

Nor is quiet and security in danger only from corrupt minds; for honest and beneficent men might often, were not the law to interpose, disturb society, and fill the country with violence. Two men, both of them wise, and both of them virtuous, may lay claim to the same possession, with pretensions, to the world specious, in their own thoughts just. Such disputes can be terminated only by force or law. Of force, it is apparent, that the exertion of it is an immediate evil, and that prevalence at last will be no proof of justice. Of law, the means are gentle and inoffensive, and the conclusion not only the confirmation of property, but the establishment of right. For this power of the law virtue itself will leave employment; for though crimes would hardly be committed but by predominance of passion, yet litigation must always subsist while there is difference of opinion. We can hope but faintly for the time when all men shall be honest; but the time seems still more remote in which all men shall be wise; and until we may be able to settle all claims for ourselves, let us rejoice that there is law to adjust them for us.

The care however of the best Governor may be frustrated by disobedience and perverseness; and the best laws may strive in vain against radicated wickedness.

It is therefore fit to consider,

Thirdly, How the people are to assist and further the endeavours of their Governors.

As all government is power exerted by few upon many, it is apparent that nations cannot be governed but by their own consent. The first duty therefore of subjects is obedience to the laws; such obedience as is the effect, not of compulsion, but of reverence; such as arises from a conviction of the in-

ſtability of human virtue, and of the neceſſity of ſome coercive power, which may reſtrain the exorbitancies of paſſion, and check the career of natural deſires.

No man thinks laws unneceſſary for others; and no man, if he conſiders his own inherent frailty, can juſtly think them unneceſſary for himſelf. The wiſeſt man is not always wiſe, and the beſt man is not always good. We all ſometimes want the admonition of law, as ſupplemental to the dictates of reaſon, and the ſuggeſtions of conſcience. And he that encourages irreverence, in himſelf, or others, to public inſtitutions, weakens all the human ſecurities of peace and all the corroborations of virtue.

That the proper influence of government may be preſerved, and that the liberty which a juſt diſtribution of power naturally ſupports, may not operate to its deſtruction, it is always to be remembered, that even the errors and deficiencies of authority muſt be treated with reſpect. All inſtitutions are deſective by their nature; and all Rulers have their imperfections, like other men. But, as not every failing makes a bad man, ſo not every error makes a bad government; and he that conſiders how few can properly adjuſt their own houſes, will not wonder that into the multiplicity of national affairs deception or negligence ſhould ſometimes find their way. It is likewiſe neceſſary to remember, that as government is difficult to be adminiſtered, it is difficult to be underſtood; and that where very few have capacity to judge, very few have a right to cenſure. The happineſs of a nation muſt ariſe from the combined endeavors of Governors and ſubjects. The duties of governing can be the lot of few, but all of us have the duties of ſubjects to perform; and every man ought to incite in himſelf, and in his neighbour, that obedience to the laws, and that reſpect to the chief Magiſtrate, which may ſecure and promote concord and quiet. Of this, as of all other virtues, the true baſis is religion. The laws will be eaſily obeyed by him who adds to human ſanctions the obligations of conſcience; and he will not eaſily be diſpoſed to cenſure his ſuperiors, whom religion has made acquainted with his own feelings.

SERMON XXV.

[WRITTEN BY DR. JOHNSON, FOR THE FUNERAL OF HIS WIFE.]

JOHN xi. 25. 26. (FORMER PART.)

Jesus said unto her, I am the Resurrection, and the Life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth, and believeth in me, shall never die.

TO afford adequate consolations to the last hour, to cheer the gloomy passage through the valley of the shadow of death, and to ease that anxiety, to which beings, prescient of their own dissolution, and conscious of their own danger, must be necessarily exposed, is the privilege only of revealed religion. All those, to whom the supernatural light of heavenly doctrine has never been imparted, however formidable for power, or illustrious for wisdom, have wanted that knowledge of their future state which alone can give comfort to misery, or security to enjoyment; and have been forced to rush forwards to the grave, through the darkness of ignorance; or, if they happened to be more refined and inquisitive, to solace their passage with the fallacious and uncertain glimmer of philosophy.

There were, doubtless, at all times, as there are now, many who lived with very little thought concerning their end; many whose time was wholly filled up by public or domestic business, by the pursuits of ambition, or the desire of riches; many who dissolved themselves in luxurious enjoyment, and, when they could lull their minds by any present pleasure, had no regard to distant events, but withheld their imagination from sallying out into futurity, or catching any terror that might interrupt their quiet; and there were many who rose so little above animal life, that they were completely engrossed by the objects about them, and had their views extended no farther than to the next hour; in whom the ray of reason was half extinct, and who had neither hopes nor fears, but of some near advantage, or some pressing danger.

But multitudes there must always be, and greater multitudes, as arts and civility prevail, who cannot wholly with-

draw their thoughts from death. All cannot be distracted with business, or stunned with the clamours of assemblies, or the shouts of armies. All cannot live in the perpetual dissipation of successive diversions, nor will all enslave their understandings to their senses, and seek felicity in the gross gratifications of appetite. Some must always keep their reason and their fancy in action, and seek either honour or pleasure from intellectual operations; and from them, others more negligent or sluggish, will be in time fixed or awakened; knowledge will be perpetually diffused, and curiosity hourly enlarged.

But, when the faculties were once put in motion, when the mind had broken loose from the shackles of sense, and made excursions to remote consequences, the first consideration that would stop her course must be the incessant waste of life; the approach of age, and the certainty of death; the approach of that time, in which strength must fail, and pleasure fly away, and the certainty of that dissolution which shall put an end to all the prospects of this world. It is impossible to think, and not sometimes to think on death. Hope, indeed, has many powers of delusion; whatever is possible, however unlikely, it will teach us to promise ourselves; but death no man has escaped, and therefore no man can hope to escape it. From this dreadful expectation no shelter or refuge can be found. Whatever we see, forces it upon us; whatever is, new or old, flourishing or declining, either directly, or by a very short deduction, leads man to the consideration of his end; and accordingly we find, that the fear of death has always been considered as the great enemy of human quiet, the polluter of the feast of happiness, and embitterer of the cup of joy. The young man who rejoiceth in his youth, amidst his music and his gaiety, has always been disturbed with the thought, that his youth will be quickly at an end. The monarch, to whom it is said that he is a God, has always been reminded by his own heart, that he shall die like man.——This unwelcome conviction, which is thus continually pressed upon the mind, every art has been employed to oppose. The general remedy, in all ages, has been to chase it

away from the present moment, and to gain a suspense of the pain that could not be cured. In the ancient writings we, therefore, find the shortness of life frequently mentioned as an excitement to jollity and pleasure; and may plainly discover, that the authors had no other means of relieving that gloom with which the uncertainty of human life clouded their conceptions. Some of the philosophers, indeed, appear to have sought a nobler, and a more certain remedy, and to have endeavoured to overpower the force of death by arguments, and to dispel the gloom by the light of reason. They enquired into the nature of the soul of man, and shewed, at least probably, that it is a substance distinct from matter, and therefore independent of the body, and exempt from dissolution and corruption. The arguments, whether physical, or moral, upon which they established this doctrine, it is not necessary to recount to a christian audience, by whom it is believed upon more certain proofs, and higher authority; since, though they were such as might determine the calm mind of a philosopher, inquisitive *only after truth*, and uninfluenced by external objects, yet they were such as required leisure and capacity, not allowed in general to mankind; they were such as many could never understand, and of which, therefore, the efficacy and comfort were confined to a small number, without any benefit to the unenlightened multitude.

Such has been hitherto the nature of philosophical arguments, and such it must probably forever remain; for, though, perhaps, the successive industry of the studious may encrease the number, or advance the probability, of arguments; and, though continual contemplation of matter will, I believe, shew it, at length, wholly incapable of motion, sensation, or order, by any powers of its own, and therefore necessarily establish the immateriality, and, probably, the immortality of the soul; yet there never can be expected a time, in which the gross body of mankind can attend to such speculations, or can comprehend them; and, therefore, there never can be a time, in which this knowledge can be taught in such a manner as to be generally conducive to virtue, or happiness, but by a messenger from God, from the Creator of the world, and the Father of Spirits.

To perſuade common and uninſtructed minds to the belief of any fact, we may every day perceive, that the teſtimony of one man, whom they think worthy of credit, has more force than the arguments of a thouſand reaſoners, even when the arguments are ſuch as they may be imagined completely qualified to comprehend. Hence it is plain, that the conſtitution of mankind is ſuch, that abſtruſe and intellectual truths can be taught no otherwiſe than by poſitive aſſertion, ſupported by ſome ſenſible evidence, by which the aſſerter is ſecured from the ſuſpicion of falſehood; and that if it ſhould pleaſe God to inſpire a teacher with ſome demonſtration of the immortality of the ſoul, it would far leſs avail him for general inſtruction, than the power of working a miracle in its vindication, unleſs God ſhould, at the ſame time, inſpire all the hearers with docility and apprehenſion, and turn, at once, all the ſenſual, the giddy, the lazy, the buſy, the corrupt and the proud, into humble, abſtracted, and diligent philoſophers.

To bring life and immortality to light, to give ſuch proofs of our future exiſtence, as may influence the moſt narrow mind, and fill the moſt capacious intellect, to open proſpects beyond the grave, in which the thought may expatiate without obſtruction, and to ſupply a refuge and ſupport to the mind, amidſt all the miſeries of decaying nature, is the peculiar excellence of the Goſpel of Chriſt. Without this heavenly inſtructor, he who feels himſelf ſinking under the weight of years, or melting away by the ſlow waſte of a lingering diſeaſe, has no other remedy than obdurate patience, a gloomy reſignation to that which cannot be avoided; and he who follows his friend, or whoever there is yet dearer than a friend, to the grave, can have no other conſolation than that which he derives from the general miſery; the reflection, that he ſuffers only what the reſt of mankind muſt ſuffer; a poor conſideration, which rather awes us to ſilence, than ſoothes us to quiet, and which does not abate the ſenſe of our calamity, though it may ſometimes make us aſhamed to complain.

But ſo much is our condition improved by the Goſpel, ſo much is the ſting of death rebated, that we may now be invited

to the contemplation of our mortality, as to a pleasing employment of the mind, to an exercise delightful and recreative, not only when calamity and persecution drive us out from the assemblies of men, and sorrow and woe represent the grave as a refuge and an asylum, but even in the hours of the highest earthly prosperity, when our cup is full, and when we have laid up stores for ourselves; for, in him who believes the promise of the Saviour of the World, it can cause no disturbance to remember, that this night his soul may be required of him; and he who suffers one of the sharpest evils which this life can shew, amidst all its varieties of misery; he that has lately been separated from the person whom a long participation of good and evil had endeared to him; he who has seen kindness snatched from his arms, and fidelity torn from his bosom; whose ear is no more to be delighted with tender instruction, and whose virtue shall be no more awakened by the seasonable whispers of mild reproof, may yet look, without horror, on the tomb which encloses the remains of what he loved and honoured, as upon a place which, if it revives the sense of his loss, may calm him with the hope of that state in which there shall be no more grief or separation.

To Christians the celebration of a funeral is by no means a solemnity of barren and unavailing sorrow, but established by the church for other purposes.

First, for the consolation of sorrow. Secondly, for the enforcement of piety. The mournful solemnity of the burial of the dead is instituted, first, for the consolation of that grief to which the best minds, if not supported and regulated by religion, are most liable. They who most endeavour the happiness of others, who devote their thoughts to tenderness and pity, and studiously maintain the reciprocation of kindness, by degrees mingle their souls, in such a manner, as to feel from their separation, a total destitution of happiness, a sudden abruption of all their prospects, a cessation of all their hopes, schemes and desires. The whole mind becomes a gloomy vacuity, without any image or form of pleasure, a chaos of confused wishes, directed to no particular end, or to that which, while we wish,

we cannot hope to obtain; for the dead will not revive; those whom God has called away from the present state of existence, can be seen no more in it; we must go to them: but they cannot return to us.

Yet, to shew that grief is vain, is to afford very little comfort; yet this is all that reason can afford; but religion, our only friend in the moment of distress, in the moment when the help of man is vain, when fortitude and cowardice sink down together, and the sage and the virgin mingle their lamentations; religion will inform us, that sorrow and complaint are not only vain, but unreasonable and erroneous. The voice of God, speaking by his Son and his Apostles, will instruct us, that she, whose departure we now mourn, is not dead, but sleepeth; that only her body is committed to the ground, but that the soul is returned to God, who gave it; that God, who is infinitely merciful, who hateth nothing that he has made, who desireth not the death of a sinner; to that God, who only can compare performance with ability, who alone knows how far the heart has been pure, or corrupted, how inadvertency has surprised, fear has betrayed, or weakness has impeded; to that God, who marks every aspiration after a better state, who hears the prayer which the voice cannot utter, records the purpose that perished without opportunity of action, the wish that vanished away without attainment, who is always ready to receive the penitent, to whom sincere contrition is never late, and who will accept the tears of a returning sinner.

Such are the reflections to which we are called by the voice of Truth; and from these we shall find that comfort which philosophy cannot supply, and that peace which the world cannot give. The contemplation of the mercy of God may justly afford some consolation, even when the office of burial is performed to those who have been snatched away without visible amendment of their lives; for, who shall presume to determine the state of departed souls, to lay open what God hath concealed, and to search the counsels of the "Most Highest?"—But, with more confident hope of pardon and acceptance, may we commit those to the receptacles of mortality, who have lived with-

out any open or enormous crimes; who have endeavored to propitiate God by repentance, and have died, at laſt, with hope and reſignation. Among theſe ſhe ſurely may be remembered whom we have followed hither to the tomb, to pay her the laſt honours, and to reſign her to the grave; ſhe, whom many, who now hear me, have known, and whom none, who were capable of diſtinguiſhing either moral or intellectual excellence, could know, without eſteem, or tenderneſs. To praiſe the extent of her knowledge, the acuteneſs of her wit, the *accuracy* of her judgment, the force of her ſentiments, or the elegance of her expreſſion, would ill ſuit with the occaſion.

Such praiſe would little profit the living, and as little gratify the dead, who is now in a place where competitions are forgotten forever; where ſhe finds a cup of water given for the relief of a poor brother, a prayer uttered for the mercy of God to thoſe whom ſhe wanted power to relieve, a word of inſtruction to ignorance, a ſmile of comfort to miſery, of more avail than all thoſe accompliſhments which confer *honour and diſtinction* among the ſons of Folly.—Yet, let it be remembered, that her wit was never employed to ſcoff at goodneſs, nor her reaſon to diſpute againſt truth. In this age of wild opinions, ſhe was as free from ſcepticiſm as the cloiſtered virgin. She never wiſhed to ſignalize herſelf by the ſingularity of paradox. She had a juſt diſhdence of her own reaſon, and deſired to practiſe rather than diſpute. Her practice was ſuch as her opinions naturally produced. She was exact and regular in her devotions, full of confidence in the divine mercy, ſubmiſſive to the diſpenſations of Providence, extenſively charitable in her judgments and opinions, grateful for every kindneſs that ſhe received, and willing to impart aſſiſtance of every kind to all whom her little power enabled her to benefit. She paſſed through many months of languor, weakneſs and decay, without a ſingle murmur of impatience, and often expreſſed her adoration of that mercy which granted her ſo long time for recollection and penitence. That ſhe had no failings, cannot be ſuppoſed: but ſhe has now appeared before the Almighty Judge; and it would ill become beings like us, weak and ſinful as herſelf, to remember

thoſe faults which, we truſt, Eternal Purity has pardoned. Let us therefore preſerve her memory for no other end but to imitate her virtues; and let us add her example to the motives of piety which this ſolemnity was, ſecondly, inſtituted to enforce.

It would not indeed be reaſonable to expect, did we not know the inattention and perverſeneſs of mankind, that any one who had followed a funeral, could fail to return home without new reſolutions of a holy life: for, who can ſee the final period of all human ſchemes and undertakings, without conviction of the vanity of all that terminates in the preſent ſtate? For, who can ſee the wiſe, the brave, the powerful, or the beauteous, carried to the grave without reflection on the emptineſs of all thoſe diſtinctions, which ſet us here in oppoſition to each other? And who, when he ſees the vanity of all terreſtrial advantages, can forbear to wiſh for a more permanent and certain happineſs? Such wiſhes, perhaps, often ariſe, and ſuch reſolutions are often formed; but, before the reſolution can be exerted, before the wiſh can regulate the conduct, new proſpects open before us, new impreſſions are received; the temptations of the world ſolicit, the paſſions of the heart are put into commotion; we plunge again into the tumult, engage again in the conteſt, and forget, that what we gain cannot be kept, and that the life, for which we are thus buſy to provide, muſt be quickly at an end.

But, let us not be thus ſhamefully deluded! Let us not thus idly periſh in our folly, by neglecting the loudeſt call of Providence; nor, when we have followed our friends, and our enemies, to the tomb, ſuffer ourſelves to be ſurpriſed by the dreadful ſummons, and die, at laſt, amazed and unprepared! Let every one whoſe eye glances on this bier, examine what would have been his condition, if the ſame hour had called him to judgment, and remember that, though he is now ſpared, he may, perhaps, be to-morrow among ſeparate ſpirits. The preſent moment is in our power; let us, therefore, from the preſent moment, begin our repentance! Let us not, any longer, harden our hearts, but hear, this day, the voice of our Saviour and our

God, and begin to do, with all our powers, whatever we shall wish to have done, when the grave shall open before us! Let those who came hither weeping and lamenting, reflect, that they have not time for useless sorrow; that their own salvation is to be secured, and that the day is far spent, and the night cometh, when no man can work; that tears are of no value to the dead, and that their own danger may justly claim their whole attention! Let those who entered this place unaffected and indifferent, and whose only purpose was to behold this *funeral Spectacle*, consider, that she, whom they thus behold with negligence, and pass by, was lately partaker of the same nature with themselves; and that they likewise are hastening to their end, and must soon, by others equally negligent, be buried and forgotten! Let all remember, that the day of life is short, and that the day of grace may be much shorter; that this may be the last warning which God will grant us, and that, perhaps, he, who looks on this grave unalarmed, may sink unreformed into his own!

Let it, therefore, be our care, when we retire from *this solemnity*, that we immediately turn from our wickedness, and do that which is lawful and right; that, whenever disease or violence shall dissolve our bodies, our souls may be saved alive, and received into everlasting habitations; where, with angels and archangels, and all the glorious host of heaven, they shall sing glory to God on high, and the Lamb, for ever and ever!

THE END.

14 DAY USE
TURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.
This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

REC. CIR. JUN 24 '76

MAR 14 '67 -2 PM
LOAN DEPT.
DEC 2 1967 57
RECEIVED
NOV 18 '67 -9 AM
LOAN DEPT.
JUN 14 1969 35
JUN 14 '69 -2 PM
MAR 19 1975 16
REC. CIR. MAR 17 '75
DEC 14 1976 7

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

LD 21A-60m-7,'66
(G4427s10)476B

LD 21-100m-8,'34

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C020078503

BX
2155
9947
M3
McCalla

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY